





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

# THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

Perspectives on Man

Some Certainties in An Age of Doubt

The Minister as Politician

The Relation of Religion to Government

The University as a Place of Revolution

Sermons:

Fathers and Sons

The Little Word "Amen"

Chapel Talks:

Mature Priests

Dialectics of Discipleship

Pannenberg's Recent Book on Christology

A Checklist of Works in Hymnody

James I. McCord

John R. Gray

Charles H. Bayer

George F. Kennan

Ernest Gordon

Seward Hiltner

Jack M. Maxwell

Diogenes Allen

Ian F. McIntosh

Bruce M. Metzger

Samuel J. Rogal

VOLUME LXII, NUMBER 1

WINTER 1969

# PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

James I. McCord

President

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John M. Templeton, President

Bryant M. Kirkland, Vice-President

Frederick E. Christian, Secretary

Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, New York, N.Y., Treasurer

James I. Armstrong  
Clem E. Bininger  
Eugene Carson Blake  
Stewart S. Cort  
William H. Felmeth  
Allan M. Frew  
John T. Galloway  
Miss Eleanor P. Kelly  
Harry G. Kuch  
Charles T. Leber, Jr.  
Raymond I. Lindquist  
John S. Linen  
J. Keith Loudon  
Henry Luce, III  
Conrad H. Massa  
Robert L. McNeil

Robert B. Munger  
W. Beverly Murphy  
Clifford G. Pollock  
Luther I. Replogle  
William H. Scheide  
H. D. Moore Sherrerd  
Laird H. Simons, Jr.  
W. Sherman Skinner  
Frederick B. Speakman  
George E. Sweazey  
William P. Thompson  
James M. Tunnell, Jr.  
Samuel G. Warr  
David B. Watermulder  
Irving A. West  
George S. Young

## TRUSTEES EMERITI

John G. Buchanan  
Richard J. Dearborn  
Peter K. Emmons  
Henry Hird

Weir C. Ketler  
Thomas M. MacMillan  
Mrs. John J. Newberry

## THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

DONALD MACLEOD, *Editor*

EDWARD J. JURJI, *Book Review Editor*

The BULLETIN is published quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey. Numbers 1, 2, and 3 of each volume are mailed free of charge to all alumni and on an exchange basis with various institutions. Numbers 4 and 5 in the series are the academic catalogues (undergraduate and graduate) of the Seminary and may be obtained by request to the Office of the Registrar.

*Second class postage paid at Princeton, N.J. 08540*

# The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. LXII

WINTER, 1969

NUMBER 1

Donald Macleod, Editor

Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

Excerpta and Commentaria		3
Perspectives on Man	<i>James I. McCord</i>	12
Some Certainties in An Age of Doubt	<i>John R. Gray</i>	19
The Minister as Politician	<i>Charles H. Bayer</i>	36
The Relation of Religion to Government	<i>George F. Kennan</i>	42
The University as a Place of Revolution	<i>Ernest Gordon</i>	48
Sermons:		
Fathers and Sons	<i>Seward Hiltner</i>	53
The Little Word "Amen"	<i>Jack M. Maxwell</i>	58
Chapel Talks:		
Mature Priests	<i>Diogenes Allen</i>	64
Dialectics of Discipleship	<i>Ian F. McIntosh</i>	67
Pannenberg's Recent Book on Christology	<i>Bruce M. Metzger</i>	71
A Checklist of Works in Hymnody	<i>Samuel J. Rogal</i>	75
BOOK REVIEWS:		
Service in Christ, by J. I. McCord & T.H.L. Parker	<i>William O. Fennell</i>	80
Christian Theology and Metaphysics, by P. R. Baelz	<i>Diogenes Allen</i>	82
Religion and Understanding, ed. by D. Z. Phillips		83
Leibniz: Theodicy, ed. by Diogenes Allen	<i>Hector J. Massey</i>	84
Das Alte Testament und Jesus Christus, by C. Westermann	<i>B. W. Anderson</i>	84
Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament, by James Barr	<i>Charles T. Fritsch</i>	85
Elder and Younger Brothers, by A. Roy Eckardt	<i>Henry S. Gehman</i>	86
Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, by I. Abrahams		86
Mark the Evangelist, by Willi Marxsen	<i>Otto A. Piper</i>	87
Soli Deo Gloria, ed. by J. McD. Richards	<i>J. Wm. Aldridge</i>	89
The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus, ed. by Gregory Dix	<i>F. Froehlich</i>	89
William Carstares and the Kirk by Law Established, by A. I. Dunlop	<i>Norman V. Hope</i>	90
George Bell, Bishop of Chichester, by R.C.D. Jasper		91
A Song of Ascents, by E. Stanley Jones		92
The Reformation in Germany, by Joseph Lortz	<i>James H. Nichols</i>	93

The French Enlightenment and the Jews, by A. Hertzberg	<i>James H. Nichols</i>	93
The Manipulator and the Church, by M. D. Dunham, G. J. Herbertson, & E. L. Shostrom	<i>Arthur M. Adams</i>	94
Ministry and Management, by Peter F. Rudge		94
The Black Messiah, by Albert B. Cleage, Jr.	<i>J. Wm. Aldridge</i>	95
Asian Psychology, by Gardner & Lois B. Murphy	<i>Seward Hiltner</i>	95
Referral in Pastoral Counseling, by W. B. Oglesby	<i>James N. Lapsley</i>	96
Violent Sleep, by Richard Luecke	<i>Donald Macleod</i>	97
Sermons for Today, by J. H. Withers, G. E. Harris, and J. Banks		97
The Preacher's Heritage, Task, and Resources, by Ralph G. Turnbull		98
Profession: Minister, by James D. Glasse	<i>Jack M. Maxwell</i>	99
Sing of Life and Faith, by M. Miller & L. C. Drew	<i>Laurence H. Stookey</i>	100
Words, Music, and the Church, by Eric Routley		101
Bibliography of Faculty Publications, 1968		104

# Excerpta and Commentaria

## *Student Unrest*

CONSTRUCTIVE talk about current academic or student unrest is not easy to come by, yet here and there, if we listen, sober voices can be heard outlining positive ways to forestall unpleasant situations. Emergent situations may demand emergent methods, but maybe the assurance of long-range strategies would prove eventually to be both preventive and remedial instead of "fifteen minutes to meditate—and out!"

Among the most stimulating, honest, and hard-hitting presentations on the controversial subject of student unrest was given by Albert W. Trueman, Chancellor of the University of Western Ontario, and lecturer on Shakespeare at Carleton University in Ottawa. "As we read history," observes Dr. Trueman, "it seems clear that there is always a time-lag between the realization and development of human need on the one hand, and the creation of institutions, legislation and other forms of response calculated to meet these needs, on the other. Needs never cease to be stated; answers are always late."

Society can absorb this disparity "provided that the time-lag does not become too great." But, Dr. Trueman indicates, "this time-lag in university affairs has become too great to be quietly and hopefully endured." And, therefore, he feels "we have to act more quickly than we have been disposed to, intelligently and firmly, if we hope to avoid an even uglier situation than the one that is looming on our horizon."

Undoubtedly one of the basic aspirations of student bodies may be summed up in the one word—involvement. "It is characteristic of our century," says Dr. Trueman, "that the governed are determined to have a larger and larger share in their government. This movement is inevitable, and in my opinion, right. It is a tide that cannot be dammed back or reversed. Obviously the sensible thing to do is to respond with intelligence and understanding to these tidal changes, and to avoid violence by involving everyone concerned—faculty, students, administration, trustees (or governors)—in well-meant, useful, and constructive consultation and reform activity. I think we are blind if we refuse to see that we are in a period of transition which will come to an end only when university government is largely, but not exclusively, in the hands of faculty, assisted by the students, either on equal terms or as somewhat junior partners."

This concept of involvement, however, is not easily implemented where institutions of higher learning are governed "by boards which reflect only the acumen and experience of representatives of business and financial 'know-how.' No one can find serious fault with the quality of this representation. In the day when this type of Board (trustees or directors) was developed, when the proportion of income by government was much lower than it is now, these business representatives constituted a natural and necessary link with the business world which was an extremely important source of support."

"But," Dr. Trueman declares, "times have changed. Our colleges and univer-



sities have increased enormously in size. The world-tide of conviction that the governed must have a much greater share in government is running swiftly, strongly, and irresistibly. The direct contribution of private persons and business corporations to the coffers of our universities has been largely replaced by contributions of government, both state and federal. In other words, an important part of the function of the business man on the Board has been practically eliminated."

In view of this orientation of educational support, it is Dr. Trueman's feeling that "the board of governors or directors at the apex of university government is becoming a rapidly obsolescent institution." Moreover, from another perspective, it does seem "an anomaly that an institution whose sole concern is the fostering and promotion of art, the humanities, the social sciences and the professions, should be placed under a board of governors of whom the majority are business men." "A university board," he believes, "should use its own kind, at least as a majority, i.e. the scholars on its faculty and its senior students in conjunction with a smaller group of men representing the outside community and business world."

On the other hand, there is the present difficulty of campus unrest with the complexity of its means and ends. "The students," Dr. Trueman allows, "frequently contribute to the difficulty. Often they use student publications in ways that are not persuasive but antagonizing: insulting innuendoes and accusations are made that have not been researched and documented; abusive, profane, and even obscene language is used, by which unfounded assertions and poor arguments are not transformed into effective truth. Generally they have not made their cause clear to those from whom they want reforming action. Frustration on both sides is the result; and this frustration is beginning to lead to violence by the young and to an appeal to police power by the old. In the eyes of student activists, we of the older generation appear at times to be the complacent inheritors of unexamined prejudice who cannot be persuaded into change except by action that is ruthless and brutal. This culmination of the so-called 'dialogue' must be avoided."

This demand to be permitted to become involved is fed by a deeply rooted dissatisfaction with almost everything. Dr. Trueman sees the new generation as being "much more widely informed about the society they live in than were their elders. Film, radio, television, rapid communication and transport have combined to give them information we did not have and to create in them a sense of involvement in society we did not experience until we were much older and much more firmly committed to things as they are. As I read our university students, I do not believe they are asking to be relieved of work, to be freed from responsibility, to be allowed unlicensed indulgence. They appear to be insisting that the forms, procedures, and aims of university education as they now exist have become in one degree or another outmoded; that they want a type of university experience that will enable them to go out successfully into a world much of which they want to change. They are not one hundred per cent right, but there is sufficient basis for many of their dissatisfactions."

In most centers of higher learning this general demand makes itself felt at three



focal points: (i) students feel they have a right to be consulted about and to have a hand in framing the type of education they want. (ii) They maintain that the formal lecture-test-essay-examination procedure is usually sterile, dull, unduly authoritative, and much too demanding of time which could be better spent in more nearly independent study and investigation under the guidance of interested and skilled members of faculty. (iii) They resent the poor quality of much of the instruction they receive. "The increasing emphasis upon the importance of research is providing us with a stream of Ph.D.'s who for some years have been concentrating on research and ultimately a book, the Ph.D. thesis. The university inquires earnestly about their capacity to conduct research and to write more essays and books, but seemingly makes no serious inquiries about their capacity to lecture clearly and interestingly," he observed.

This, however, is not intended to belittle research. Dr. Trueman condemns the system that makes the honor-research student into an academic aristocrat and the student seeking a general education into a second-class citizen. Equally so, on the level of instruction, he deplores "the erroneous belief that no matter how scholarly a man may be and how skilful and stimulating a teacher he may be, if he is not engaged formally in research and publication, he is a second-class citizen in the academic hierarchy."

What, then, does Dr. Trueman suggest as an appropriate strategy in grappling with the current academic and campus *malaise*. He urges a reinstatement of "the humane teaching function of the university without, of course, injuring the vital research function." This means the restoration to respectability of "the learned, scholarly, critical man, whose bias of interest and whose particular abilities do not lead him into what is called research. Must we force into research a great number of scholars who must bow before the Ph.D. idol whether or not they are genuine worshippers? Can there not be a non-research Ph.D. degree?" Was not Archibald MacLeish right in saying that "the job out there in the profession or the industry is dictating the training in the graduate schools, and the graduate schools are dictating the preparation in the colleges, and the whole system congeals from the top down like a pond freezing" (*Saturday Review*, July 13, 1968).

This age of specialization, Dr. Trueman feels, is "often magnificent." He realizes that "young doctors are better and better as their specialties become more specialized. Student physicists in the great graduate schools are so notoriously productive at twenty-two that a professional physicist of thirty regards himself as middle-aged." But our times need, above all, "the educated man, the man capable not of providing specialized answers, but of asking the great and liberating questions by which humanity makes its way through time." This will require leaving off our constant questioning of where science and technology are taking us and instead we should be asking "how we can manage them so they can help us get where we want to go." And "where we want to go depends upon our conception of ourselves. If our conception of ourselves, as the university teaches it, is the conception of the applicant preparing for his job, then the question will not be answered because it will not be asked. But if our conception of ourselves, as the university teaches it, is that of men preparing to be men, to achieve ourselves as

men, then the question will be asked *and* answered because it cannot be avoided. Our need is to put the idea of man back where it once stood, at the focus of our lives, to restore to mankind a conception of humanity with which humanity can live."

### *BGEA: A Saga of Success and Expansion*

Recently "The Economist," with a Minneapolis date stamp, commented editorially on the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association and its enormous growth and success in "using the best technical aids to bring man within the sound and sight of the Gospel." In a favorable personal tribute to Dr. Graham the article referred to him in such terms as "the fourth most admired man in the United States"; "a wholesaler who works through established churches rather than building a network of his own"; "a man with a talent for delegating authority"; and a former college president "whose radio sermons in 1950 thrust fame upon him." Few of us would dispute these descriptive phrases; indeed many would add equally laudable commendations of their own.

Not many, however, are aware of the widespread and complex ministry through the written and broadcast word that operates behind the simple Gospel messages of the typical Graham evangelistic campaign. The BGEA owns most of a city block near Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, and has purchased recently a 15-acre tract in suburban Bloomington where postal facilities and warehouses will be constructed. The annual budget of the association averages approximately \$12 million, which takes care of 80 million pieces of mail, including four million copies of the monthly magazine, "Decision" (now printed in Spanish, Japanese, French, and German, as well as British and Australian editions). The outreach program is channelled through seven "ministries": the crusades, radio programs, telecasts, films, follow-up counselling, letter correspondence, and the magazine. Royalties from Dr. Graham's books and his syndicated newspaper column are invested in an educational trust fund. His latest book, *World Aflame*, has had sales of over three million copies.

The comment concludes: "The web of activities controlled or given oversight from the home office with its staff of 450 employees includes World Wide Pictures of Burbank, California, described as the world's largest producer and distributor of religious films. The weekly radio program, Hour of Decision, which started it all in 1950, goes out over 1,000 radio stations and claims an audience of 20 million."

### *Rabbi Weinberg: Lone Campaigner*

If Rabbi Yaakov Weinberg realizes his aim, he will establish a world center of Jewish studies in Canada's Queen City, Toronto. Presently he is Rosh Yeshivah (Head of the School) at Ner Israel Yeshiva College, the only university-level center for Jewish sacred study in Canada. Leaving Baltimore in 1964, Rabbi Weinberg came to Toronto from his post as director of graduate studies in a

rabbinical college and will see ordained this year the first class of rabbis who have been trained in a Canadian school of learning.

In addresses given abroad, both at the National Conference of European Rabbis and at a convention of teachers of the National Hebrew Day School Movement in New York, Weinberg advanced his theory "that Orthodox Judaism must throw off its ambivalence towards secular learning and bring about a synthesis between modern knowledge and the 2,500-year tradition of Talmudic scholarship." He asserts that two attitudes towards secular learning have been dominant in Orthodox Judaism: (i) suspicion and defensiveness, generated by the fact that "you could almost guarantee when a boy went to the secular university he would be lost to the Jewish people and become assimilated"; (ii) the notion that the Orthodox Jew, in order to be a complete man, must live in two worlds—the world of secular learning and of traditional practices. Rabbi Weinberg rejects any view that creates a dichotomy between sacred and secular learning. "It's not the combination," he declares, "but the integration of the two that makes the whole man. Hirsch (nineteenth century German rabbi) thought of Jews as living in two worlds; but man is the fulfillment of both worlds." "To know biology," he adds, "is to know God. Biology can broaden man's understanding of the Talmud, while the Talmud can tell man how he should use his knowledge of biology." For him secular learning and Jewish tradition are complementary and, therefore, his ambition is a program of studies to further "a cross-fertilization of the tradition of sacred learning with the science of the twentieth century."

### *Another Roman Catholic Catechism*

The religious news editor of The New York Times, Edward B. Fiske, reports a new catechism in preparation by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, entitled "Patterns of Promise." Not only will the traditional catechetical format be changed but an orientation towards the new so-called "theology of hope" will provide a unified thematic character to the document. Intended for use in the church's adult education program the catechism features frequent references to contemporary issues and quotes from familiar leaders in fields other than the traditionally religious. Its emphases are upon the wide diversities of human experience and it avoids those controversial doctrinal questions which marked the new Dutch Catechism and got the hierarchy in The Netherlands into trouble with the Vatican.

The new catechism is being developed under the direction of Msgr. Eugene F. Richard, director of the Confraternity for Christian Doctrine for the Archdiocese of New York. It will be published by St. Mary's College Press and distributed by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. Since, as Father Richard indicates, "hope is the virtue needed in our time," the influence of the new "theology of hope" school of young German theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, especially Jurgen Moltmann, Johannes Metz, and Wolfhart Pannenberg, is very evident and provides also the style in which the ideas are developed. Earlier catechisms, especially the well-known Baltimore Catechism, were cast in the formal question

and answer pattern, more suitable for instruction in the complicated facets of ancient doctrines. But post-Vatican II catechisms tend to be more informal and to take the beginning of each discussion from human experience and explore each doctrine within this context. This means, as one staff member indicated, that no doctrine is "definitive for all ages," but that "over the years Christians have responded to certain situations by formulating certain doctrines and that this process continues today."

### *Karl Barth: The Happy Theologian*

Ever since his death in December, 1968, facile pens have shaped countless tributes to Karl Barth and have referred to him as the greatest theologian of this century. Most of these eulogies have attempted to capture in mere human words the dimensions of his written works and to sense the monumental character of the theological structure he created. Occasionally, however, a writer has given us an intimate glimpse into the inner nature and character of the man—his simple faith, his rare good humor, and his genuine humanity. Martin Rumscheidt, one of the last of Barth's students from the new world, in his tribute entitled "The Happy Theologian," takes us into that well-known academic circle and we hear a student ask Dr. Barth, "What has been the most momentous theological discovery of your life?" (Incidentally—a stupid question!) After a moment's thought, Barth replied: "Jesus loves me, this I know, for the Bible tells me so." Another refers to a remark once made in Barth's presence about his preeminent position in the twentieth century; to which the great theologian's rejoinder was: "That expression really frightens me. After all there are still thirty-four years (it was 1966) of this century left, and who knows what little creature wrapped in theological diapers will become manifest when they look back on this century, as its greatest theologian."

He was, moreover, a man of real humor who laughed, and who could laugh at himself. Rumscheidt recalls how in a moment of banter, Barth said: "The angels laugh at old Karl. They laugh at the fact that he is trying to catch the truth about God in a book of dogmatics. They laugh because volume follows volume, each one thicker than the one before. As they laugh they say, 'Look, here he comes with his little wheelbarrow full of volumes of Dogmatics!'" He was a living example of what he advocated. "The theologian who has no joy in his work," he said, "is no theologian at all. Sulky faces, morose thoughts, and boring ways of speaking are intolerable in this science." His was the humor of faith. As Rumscheidt explains, "Faith is about the 'good news' and this 'good' marks the whole theology of Barth. Precisely in the knowledge of faith about the might and the finality of the world's redemption by God can man laugh, laugh at himself, laugh about the world, laugh in the happy expectation that the word which will be spoken by him who has the last word will assuredly be a good word, and an incomparably better word than any of those which man spoke."

### *Pro-Existence*

In a sermon recently before the Madison Avenue Presbyterian congregation in New York City, the Reverend David H. C. Read called "all Christian people to



seek from God a common strength to confront a world that is rapidly discarding the most basic beliefs we have long held in common." The purpose of the sermon was to show how Protestants and Roman Catholics need each other. His discussion, however, required a capsule review of the history of the relationship between these two traditions and was divided into two periods: the age of theological battles and the subsequent age of cool co-existence. Of the latter period, Dr. Read said, "there was a tacit agreement to live and let live. But the assumption was that Protestantism and Roman Catholicism were two entirely different religions." Both situations—open warfare or an armed truce—spell out "an intolerable policy for Christian people." Mere co-existence belongs to "the politics of the cold war, not to communities of men and women pledged to a common Lord."

Hence, Dr. Read calls for a new word: pro-existence. This means existing *for* each other. This is what Jesus meant in John 15:12—"This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." Nothing less than a genuine kind of pro-existence seems adequate to meet this present age of "turmoil and revolution." Indeed, "One thing seems to be clearer every day: We are watching the complete breakdown of the cluster of values—our inheritance from Judaism, Christianity, and Hellenism—that sustained what we call the civilization of the West. The moral and spiritual axioms on which our fathers depended, whether or not they obeyed them, are vanishing. Everything is questioned; everything is in flux. There is not a single assumption of the past that is now sheltered from the winds of change. There is no accepted authority, no unspoken consensus about right and wrong. The established generation is unsure of itself, fumbling and guilt-ridden. The revolutionary generation knows what it wants to overthrow, but not what it wants to construct. Yet through the confusion we sense a yearning for a new world that will not be simply the product of our technology, but something nearer to what the creed calls 'the communion of saints.'" In view of all this, he asks: "Can we ignore each other any longer?"

The most embarrassing difficulty shared by both Protestant and Roman traditions at present is "the crisis of belief and confidence within the church itself." No Protestant today rejoices in the "sudden tremor in the foundations" of the once firm bastion of Roman Catholic authority or in "the crisis of conscience" that is resulting in an "accelerating exodus of priests into the secular world." "This agony of faith," Dr. Read says, "is our burden too," because in this the future of the whole Christian Church is at stake. The difference lies in that the Roman problem is related "to the authoritarian tradition and the close-knit theological system that goes with it," whereas in the Protestant church it is "not an excess of authority and discipline but the reverse." Our situation is our having to face "the spiritual turmoil with divided ranks, conflicting voices and a desperate lack of spiritual power. We have abused our freedom through rank sectarianism, individualism—each man in his own church—and a fearful neglect of the discipline in discipleship." Hence our priority is "God's call to the church to a new harmony and fellowship in our divided world." Now is the time, Dr. Read believes, for us "to pro-exist—to minimize our differences and maximize our common faith." This means that in "a distressed and confused generation there will exist a body of men

and women who despite all differences of belief and practice can say together: 'I believe in God the Father almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord.'

### *Of Polls and Statistics*

Again the *Yearbook of the American Churches* has tidied up its columns of gains and losses and proceeds now to tell us where we are. "Statistics," someone has said, "are variable and uncertain." Yet even as approximations they can help us to see whether the index is up or down; it is for the experts to quibble over percentage gains or circumstantial losses. Membership in church and synagogue in the United States in 1968 reached a new high of 126,445,110, which is 666,454 above 1967. The impressive gain, however, is somewhat punctured when compared with the general population increase: in 1967, 64.4 per cent of the population was listed as belonging to a church or synagogue; in 1968 the ratio had slipped to 63.2 per cent. *The Official Catholic Directory* placed Roman Catholic membership at 47.5 million, which is never a reliable figure because their count is based on baptisms and not on confirmation figures as in the Protestant tradition. *The American Jewish Yearbook* puts synagogue membership at 5.7 million. The two largest Protestant denominations are the Southern Baptists with over eleven million and the United Methodist Church with slightly less than eleven million.

According to the editor of the *Yearbook of the American Churches*, Lauris B. Whitman, giving to church and general religious causes was higher in 1968. Fifty-nine Protestant bodies received from their adherents a total of \$3.6 billion. Religious building construction, however, was down from \$1.2 to \$1.09 billion.

The most noticeable change in statistics appears in the decline in church attendance during the year 1968, although the proportion of adults in the United States who attend worship in any given week is greater than in ten other nations of the Western world. Princeton's Gallup Poll reports that 43 per cent of all adults in the United States attend church in a typical week, that is, over fifty million persons. In 1940 the ratio was 37 per cent; in 1955, a peak year, it rose to 49 per cent; since 1958 there has been a gradual decline. Declining attendance occurs chiefly among young adults in their twenties and is more pronounced among Roman Catholics than Protestants. A world survey indicates the poorest church attendance in Finland (5%), Sweden (9%), and Norway (14%). Austria (38%) and The Netherlands (42%) were the only two nations with a regularity of attendance comparable to the United States.

### *In This Issue*

The Fall Convocation of Princeton Theological Seminary on September 24, 1968, marked the beginning of the 157th academic year and featured an address, entitled "Perspectives on Man," by the President, Dr. James I. McCord.

"Some Certainties in An Age of Doubt" is the substance of three lectures given during the 1968 Summer Institute of Theology by the Reverend John R. Gray, Minister, Dunblane Cathedral, Scotland. An alumnus of the Seminary (Th.M., 1939), Mr. Gray served as a chaplain in the Royal Navy, 1941-46; studied at the University of Glasgow and Yale University; was minister from 1946-66 at St.

Stephens-Buckleuch Parish Church, Glasgow; and was sometime lecturer in Practical Theology in Trinity College, Glasgow.

For the interest to students of varied and multiple ministries we publish an address, "The Minister as Politician," delivered on September 12, 1968, at the Annual Convocation of Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Indiana, by Charles H. Bayer. Mr. Bayer is minister of the University Church, Disciples of Christ, Chicago, Illinois.

On November 17, 1968 in the University Chapel, the Honorable George F. Kennan, former American Ambassador to Russia and a member of Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies, delivered an address, "The Relation of Religion to Government." This address has been widely quoted and published either in whole or in part in several of the University's journals. It is printed here with the kind permission of the Dean of the University Chapel and the author.

In a series of addresses on the current aims and character of American campus movements, the Reverend Ernest Gordon, Dean of the Chapel of Princeton University, makes some helpful and well-balanced observations upon the direction these activities are and should be taking. The second in the series is entitled, "The University as a Place of Revolution." Dean Gordon is the author of the best-selling volume, *Through the Valley of the Kwai* (Harper's, 1962).

Two sermons are made available to our readers: "Fathers and Sons," by Seward Hiltner, and "The Little Word 'Amen,'" by Jack M. Maxwell. Dr. Hiltner, Princeton's Professor of Theology and Personality, distinguished scholar and writer, and author of a forthcoming volume "Ferment in the Ministry" (Abingdon Press), delivered this sermon at Lafayette College, his *alma mater*, on Parents' Weekend, October 20, 1968. "The Little Word 'Amen'" was delivered in the Presbyterian Church of Llanerch, Philadelphia, by the Reverend Jack M. Maxwell. Dr. Maxwell is an Instructor at Princeton in the field of Homiletics and Liturgics.

Two Chapel Talks indicate ideas and reflections presented to faculty and students at the regular morning worship service on campus. "Mature Priests" was given by Professor of Philosophy, Diogenes Allen. Dr. Allen is the author of a new volume, *The Reasonableness of Faith* (Corpus Books Series). "Dialectics of Discipleship" is a study of John 21:13-22, by Ian F. McIntosh. Dr. McIntosh was a Fellow at Princeton Theological Seminary from 1964 to 1968 and is now a member of the faculty in the field of Pastoral Theology at Austin Theological Seminary in Texas.

In view of the fresh approaches and new directions of the present generation of young German scholars and theologians, including Moltmann, Metz, Sauter, and Pannenberg, it is helpful to have their more definitive works interpreted for us by our own American scholars. An evaluation of Wolfhart Pannenberg's new volume on Christology, *Jesus—God and Man*, has been prepared by Dr. Bruce M. Metzger, Collard Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Princeton Theological Seminary.

Professor Samuel J. Rogal, of the Department of English, State University College, Oswego, N.Y. has provided in earlier issues of THE BULLETIN (Vol. LXI, No. 2 & 3) two very complete and useful bibliographies in the area of hymnology. A third, "A Checklist of Works in Hymnody," completes the series.

—Donald Macleod



# Perspectives on Man

JAMES I. McCORD

TONIGHT, as Princeton Theological Seminary begins a new academic year, let me welcome new members who are joining us for the first time or who are returning after careers in other places and other ministries. To new students in the several degree programs a warm welcome is extended. You are a part of the largest student community ever assembled on this campus, and the knowledge and experience you acquire here, the decisions you will make, will determine the direction of the Church in the decades immediately ahead. The next months and years, then, are crucial not only for you but for the quality of the world we shall inhabit.

The Seminary will be enriched this year through the presence of Visiting Fellows from four continents, all distinguished scholars in their own right, and by the largest number of international students in any theological college. To you we want to listen and from you we want to learn, not only the facts about your countries and the aspirations of your people, but also about the faithfulness of God to his Church throughout the world. Only in this way can we be mutually strengthened and become partners in God's mission to mankind in Jesus Christ.

New members of faculty and staff are Dr. Bernhard Anderson, Professor of Old Testament Theology, who brings a distinguished record in theological scholarship and administration; Dr. Karlfried Froehlich, Associate Professor of the History and Theology of the Medieval Church, one of the most promising

scholars in historical studies today; Dr. J. William Aldridge, Assistant Professor of Homiletics, who like Professor Froehlich is a Basel doctor and whose leadership in the civil rights movement in Memphis in recent months has won the admiration of us all; Mr. John Bartholomew, Instructor in Christianity and Society, whose scholarly background is augmented by pastoral experience in Alaska and in Pennsylvania; the Rev. Richard S. Armstrong, Director of Development, a triple Princetonian with a Princeton University degree, a Seminary degree, and a Princeton wife, and for the past decade minister of the Oak Lane Church in Philadelphia; Dr. Nicholas Van Dyck, Associate Director of Field Education, a St. Andrews doctor and a pastor whose ministry has made a difference; the Rev. E. Burnell Chaney, recently a Princeton master, Assistant Director of Field Education; and L. Charles Willard, who will preside over the Robert E. Speer Library and who has recently returned from a research project in the Aland Institute in Muenster. The Seminary is stronger because of your presence and the freshness which you have brought to our common enterprise.

As the Seminary enters its 157th year, it may be worthwhile to take a quick look at the circumstances surrounding its beginning. Its founding date was August 12, 1812, and the first professor was Archibald Alexander. The General Assembly had before it the option of establishing one theological school or more than one, to meet the needs of the

Church in an expanding nation. The Louisiana Purchase had occurred less than a decade before this date, educational ties with Europe had been weakened or broken by independence, separation of church and state was woven into the fabric of the nation, and it was clearly up to the Church to build a new graduate professional school "to form men for the Gospel ministry." The Assembly chose to establish a single school for this purpose and to call it "The Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," still one of Princeton's official titles. The reason for this decision was undoubtedly a deep concern for the unity of the Church and the unity of the nation. The old wounds caused by the war of revolution hardly had time to heal before the War of 1812 again divided the new nation. It was against this background that the Seminary was founded as an institution where the whole Church could meet and converse, where men and women of many opinions could "speak the truth in love" in an atmosphere of openness. It belongs, then, to the very nature of Princeton to be open and hospitable to new and different ideas and to be a microcosm of the world Church. We welcome a student body that is more than 40% non-Presbyterian and a faculty in which Orthodox, Disciples, Lutherans, Methodists, as well as Presbyterians, are represented. We believe that dialogue is the essence of education, openness the essence of liberalism, and we reject the fascism of much of the Old Right and the Stalinism of some of the New Left. You have brought your ideas to a free marketplace, not to be suppressed and howled down but to be heard and to

be used for the enrichment of the whole Church and of mankind.

There is a general consensus that among the burning questions facing civilization today none is more imperative than the anthropological one. It was remarkable to see the post-Uppsala plans of the several departments and divisions of the World Council of Churches converge at this point. The Faith and Order Commission has decided to make a study of "Man in Nature and History," the Church and Society Department proposes studies on "humanization," the Department on Studies in Mission and Evangelism calls its next study "Human Institutions in the Mission of God," the Department on the Laity will make a study of "the anthropological revolution and its implications for Christian theology and the mission of the Church," and the whole Division of Ecumenical Action is confronted with the question of anthropology as it is drawn more and more into the field of education.

Here is how the situation was put by the Committee studying these various plans:

Underlying the study plans of the various departments, in this field, there seems to be a certain common denominator. It is, to put it simply, the question "What is man?" This perennial question is posed today with a great sense of urgency and existential concern. In what way is man today different from his predecessor? What has actually changed; his context of living, mode of existence, his self-understanding, or he himself? How far is human nature a datum and to what extent is he capable of change? Are these limits to interfer-

ence and control of human beings? If humanity in man is not a given datum, but a possibility, what are the criteria for man's decisions for his future? What is humanization and how does it take place in the complexity of modern society?

Is there a distinctive Christian view of man? In what way is Jesus Christ the true revelation of authentic humanity? What are the characteristics of the "new man in Christ" and the new humanity, the Church? What anthropologies are implied in modern sciences, secular ideologies, and non-Christian religions? How does the Church enter into dialogue with them? These and many other issues of contemporary significance are behind the simple question "What is man?" or "how to be human today."

The question, "What is man?," is, of course, at least as old as the psalmist, and in the centuries since it has been raised, each culture has produced its own answer, from the "featherless biped" of Plato to the "tool-using animal" of Benjamin Franklin. The Hebrew answered this question by defining man as the creature that God remembers and addresses. His existence is responsive existence. He can only be understood in relational terms.

But it was not in the Hebrew tradition that the question of man was raised decisively. It was in the Greek. Perhaps the key passage in Greek literature for this question is in one of Plato's dialogues, the *Phaedo*, where Socrates gives an autobiographical statement concerning his intellectual pilgrimage. Prior to Socrates the basic philosophical question was not "What is man?" but "What is nature?" Nearly all of the pre-Socratics

published books bearing the title *Concerning Nature*. They were struggling to lay hold of the underlying substance of things. They were all scientists, Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes, and the rest, and they all had their answers, water, fire, the boundless, and so on. But Socrates tells us that after surveying the scientific tradition he felt himself hopelessly confused. Each scientist had given a different answer, and a significant dimension of reality had been squeezed out in each case. He therefore turned his quest for reality from external nature, *phusis*, to an inquiry into the nature of man and the relationship of man to those values which have to do with the soul. A. E. Taylor has described Socrates as a man with a divine vocation, whose calling was the "tendence of the soul," or in our language, the saving of the spirit of the youth of Athens. So crucial was the role of Socrates that Francis Cornford has entitled one of his books *Before and After Socrates*.

While this was the motivation of Socrates, Greek language and Greek logic did not permit the question of man to be raised in any way other than that of man the particular, a representative of the class, "man." J. V. Langmead-Cassler has pointed this out in *The Christian in Philosophy*:

The particular is the individual as seen by man who is looking for the universal, and who feels baffled intellectually until he finds it. The singular . . . is the individual seen from the point of view of the man who is out to capture and enjoy the full flavor of its individuality.

Man, therefore, to the Greek is best described in terms of universals, "ani-

mality" and "rationality," the definition that would be given by Aristotle. The Greek tradition introduced into the history of Western thought not man the individual, the person, but man the particular, the illustration or replica of the universal.

The Christian tradition attempted to offer an alternative in terms of man the singular. But this alternative did not really take hold during the long millennium of the Middle Ages. Not even the sixteenth century Reformation raised in any decisive way the anthropological question. The reformers did ask about man as sinner, but they had neither the language nor the concepts to open afresh the anthropological question. They lived at the end of an era that had been dominated by the anxieties of guilt and condemnation, and they predictably recast the Christian faith in terms of Luther's experience of justification by faith.

In several places I have argued that the anthropological question could not really be asked with any hope of successful answer until the nineteenth century, the century preceding our own. Hence anthropology is really in its infancy. The reason for this new situation was the development of the new sciences in the nineteenth century, which was the beginning of the revolution in human knowledge that has produced today's explosion. In particular there was the development of the historical, biological, psychological, social and behavioral sciences. Each new science opened a new window through which man could be seen, now no longer as a particular, as an illustration of a universal, but as a person. Hegel laid the framework for a dynamic theory of reality in terms of God's coming to consciousness in the historical process. The biologist gave ma-

terial content to this process. The old ontology was replaced with a psychology of consciousness. Man was no longer seen as a mere occupier of space. He became an actor in time and history. The romantic movement provided the context for new human understanding. It rejected classical forms and began to emphasize the individual, the novel, the unique.

Many of the new sciences were flushed with the headiness of their new wine. They were not content to be mere windows through which single dimensions of the complex animal man could be viewed. Each new science was imperialistic in its attempt to define man exclusively in its own terms. Emil Brunner, in his great monograph, *Man in Revolt*, has pointed out that each new science became deterministic, not only defining but also holding captive man in its own terms. Each also became positivistic, a secular substitute for religion. And each produced its own ideology and became the basis for the historical movements that characterized the first half of the twentieth century.

But we have passed through the age of ideology, and a new vision of man is appearing on the horizon. Modern artists bear witness to this new phenomenon. No longer is the artist's canvas covered with daubs of paint like those found in the productions of Jackson Pollock. No longer is man reduced to bits and pieces, disembodied and disembowelled, as in Pablo Picasso's *Guernica*. Now there seems to be emerging on the canvas a new image, something with the face of a man and a form that is human. This is the new man that has arrived to populate a new age.

The most impressive quality of this new man is his sense of responsibility.



It is a quality far different from that of the past generation. There is a scene in the novel, *All Quiet on the Western Front*, that is a parable for ideological man. Soldiers in a hospital become annoyed by the singing outside the room, and one of them throws a bottle through the door to put a stop to the noise. When the inspector comes in to investigate, one of the soldiers confesses, even though it is apparent to all that he was not guilty. The inspector takes his name, turns on his heel without a word, and departs. The others ask, "But why did you say you did it? It wasn't you at all!" He grins and answers, "That doesn't matter . . . I got a crack in the head and they presented me with a certificate to say that I was periodically not responsible for my actions. Ever since then I've had a grand time."

For decades man has had to struggle to affirm his responsibility. All of the odds seemingly have been stacked against him. Psychology has been bound up in Freudian predestinarianism and has insisted that man's conscious life is like the exposed tip of an iceberg, while it is lived by the vast subterranean reaches of a subconscious that is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. Marxist determinists have tried to convince him of the overruling power of the economic process and of his impotence in the face of history's inexorable logic.

But modern man wills to be responsible, even for his own guilt, rather than to inhabit a mechanistic world. Archibald MacLeish's *J.B.* speaks for him when he says:

I'd rather suffer  
Every unspeakable suffering God  
sends,  
Knowing it was I that suffered,

I that earned the need to suffer,  
I that acted, I that chose,  
Than wash my hands with yours in  
that  
Defiling innocence. Can we be men  
And make an irresponsible ignorance  
Responsible for everything?

Social scientists testify to the same new awareness of responsibility and bear witness to the reality and significance of human decision. Nearly all of their old breed, the "society makes you what you are and then makes you like it" boys, have retired, after years of making bad sociology out of discarded science. Psychologists are now speaking of will and willing in a new way. They are all describing the new man who is emerging all over the globe. No longer is he willing to trade responsibility for protection or to exchange freedom for bread. He wills to join the human race, to affirm his own humanity, and to work out his own destiny among the family of nations. This new responsible man seems to be rising in all parts of the world—in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and in the urban ghettos of America.

And this, of course, is our challenge today. We are called to be a responsible people that is eager to share its common humanity with men everywhere, that knows no difference of race or color, that is beguiled by no narrow nationalism or parochialism, and that is committed to building a world in which responsible men can live in peace and find fulfillment. As Americans we began this revolutionary movement nearly two centuries ago, and now we are summoned to continue it by joining the new stirring among the races of men

and by becoming partners in their hopes, plans, aspirations, and ideals.

The second characteristic of the new man is a chastened view of reality. He understands evil not as the product of the lowest in human nature but as a byproduct of man's highest gift, his freedom. Evil is a spiritual disease. A few years ago when officials of the Russian Orthodox Church were guests of the Seminary in Princeton, they were received by J. Robert Oppenheimer, the late director of the Institute for Advanced Study. When Metropolitan Nikodim asked Dr. Oppenheimer if he had any final words to share with him and his colleagues, the frail nuclear scientist responded, "The longer I live and the more I read, the more I am impressed with the individual's responsibility to history and with the inner nature of evil."

This is the insight that makes the novels of Fyodor Dostoevski permanently relevant. He understood this spiritual disease of the creature that oscillates between arrogance and sloth, *hubris*, and apathy. And nowhere is this disease more clearly to be discerned than in twentieth century man's inability to cope with freedom. We are the products of the revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that liberated man. But the revolution of our century has been totalitarian, confiscating identity and demanding lives of servitude. Adolf Hitler has been our spokesman: "I will make all Germans unfree in order to make Germany free." We have substituted the abstract for the concrete and have dehumanized man.

It is this fatal tendency that has given the new man a chastened view of reality. His interest and participation in politics have taken on a new dimension, for it

is in the political arena that he is so easily betrayed. Like Frankie Perez in *The Adventures of A Young Man*, he realizes that he must fight two revolutions at the same time, one revolution for human freedom and the other revolution to protect the first.

Finally, the new man understands that his humanity is not a possession that is brought into life at birth whole and intact, but an acquisition, something to be completed and fulfilled throughout his life. Just as a person born into this world has a right to expect good health and to demand the conditions conducive to such health, so any man born into the world has a right to expect the development of his full humanity and to demand the conditions necessary for this end. "To make and keep human life human" must be more than a cliché or slogan. It will involve opposition to all forces that attempt to dehumanize and depersonalize human existence, forces inherent in modern technological society that the Roumanian novelist, Virgil Gheorghiu, has described in *The Twenty-fifth Hour*:

But recently a new species of animal has appeared on the surface of the earth. These animals are called Citizens. They do not live in the jungle or the forests, but in offices. Yet they are more ferocious than the beasts of the jungle. They are a bastard breed of Man and Machine—a degenerate breed, but today the most powerful on earth. Their faces are the faces of men, and outwardly they are indistinguishable from human beings. But soon enough it becomes obvious that they don't behave like human beings. They behave exactly like machines. They have chronometers in place of hearts.

Their brain too is a kind of machine. They are neither machines nor men. Their appetites are those of wild beasts, but they are not wild beasts. They are Citizens . . . a strange mongrel type. They have gone forth and multiplied to the ends of the earth.

Today we have a choice of joining the neurotic segment of the world's population and opting out of the struggle, or becoming a part of a new movement bent on creating a new age more hospitable to personal values and with larger generosity of spirit than man has ever known. It will involve a new humanism far deeper than the humanism of the classical era. Classical humanism is snobbish and individualistic. It is detached and aloof. It leads ultimately to

isolation. Let me hold before you a Biblical humanism, for I refuse to surrender the word "humanism" to those outside the Christian faith—a humanism which believes that a person's full humanity is something to be possessed and which finds the possibility of becoming the complete man only in him who is the mirror of mankind, Jesus Christ.

The Christian belongs to the future, not to the past, and you are summoned to call this world into the future. The future does not belong to the fearful. Those who fear the most believe the least. The future will belong to those new men who resolutely move forward to possess their full humanity and who seek its fulfillment in the service of others.



# Some Certainties in An Age of Doubt

JOHN R. GRAY

EACH age is apt to dramatize itself, and ours is no exception. Indeed, there probably never was an epoch so painfully introspective, so self-conscious as ours is, and the more we reflect on ourselves the more perplexed we seem to become and the more full of doubts. Doubt, of course, is to be distinguished from atheism which, while negative, is definite—often defiantly so. But our age is as reluctant to commit itself to denial as to affirmation. It simply does not know.

General Smuts, with typical percipience, once declared: "Humanity has struck its tents and is on the march," and the march sometimes seems to be a wander through the wilderness. Walter Lippmann, in a very distinguished television interview in Britain, said that what alarmed him most in our day was "the disintegration of hope and belief." The naked ape, robbed of his location at the center of a cosy little world, shivers in the chill winds that blow in from the immensity of outer space.

The Bible I use, printed this century in Oxford, notes in the margin that heaven, the earth, and the sea were created 4,004 years before Christ. Compare with that calm certainty the news contained in a paragraph in a newspaper the other day that a mosquito, one hundred million years old, had been found in a piece of resin. Or compare with the pre-Copernican universe the fact that light has been travelling from some stars since long before Christ was born and has not yet reached us. And the end is not yet. Those who know

most about the "age" of the universe and its "size" know best that we are only touching the very fringes of knowledge.

Zophar, in the Book of Job, asks, "What canst thou know?" And we might, more than any previous age, echo the same question. Every day the boundaries of knowledge are being pushed further and further out. Their investigation is increasingly beyond any single man. The Library of Congress contains 38,000,000 items. Reading a book a day an avid reader might read 20,000 books in a life-time, about one in two thousand.

If you think of all of the discovered mass of information as well as of all the facts not yet discovered, and then go on to ask who and of what sort we are who seek to know, you might well despair. Against the backdrop of our ancient universe, we are creatures akin to the moth in the length of time we are on the earth. To quote Job again:

Vain man would be wise,  
Though man be born like a wild ass's colt.

Our intellectual life is hemmed-in in the sixty years between one childishness and the next. How little any of us can know compared with all there is to know. The mark of a wise man in these days—scientist, scholar, expert—is not an assured conceit, but a diffident humility. The more we learn in any field the less inclined we shall be to be opinionative or dogmatic about it. There is nothing certain any more. And if the

things of time elude our knowledge, how much more certainly the things of eternity.

The writers of the Catechisms, either Calvinist or Catholic, were so sure of so many things which now seem in doubt. There is something nearly impertinent, too, in the confident—almost nonchalant—way in which still we rattle off the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord." And so on to "I believe in the Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting." What a lot that is for anyone to believe.

Far better surely that we should as preachers and as Christians freely and openly confess to our doubts. Let the full blast of Altizer, Hamilton, Van Buren, Cox, Harvey, the Bishop of Woolwich, Bultmann, Uncle Tom Cobly and all blow upon us. It will knock down our idols, but not affect our God. The only heresy is error. The nearer we get to truth, the nearer we are to God. There is nothing more salutary for ourselves and for our people than for us to admit that there are a large number of things we do not know.

We affirm too much; indeed we assume an omniscience we do not possess. There are still some preachers in this country who on the authority of God assert that the sun goes round the earth. Their young hearers know that this is false, and so are apt to assume that much else they say is false too. There are preachers in Scotland who say that it is sinful to go for a walk by the loch-side on a Sunday. And healthy youngsters brought up to think of that as Christianity reject it—and rightly so.

We should be careful not to assert

that anything is finally true unless we *know* that it belongs to the very substance of the Faith. A reverent agnosticism is the most seemly attitude to take about Angels, about the Lost Tribes, about the mode of the Ascension, about what Heaven is like, and a vast number of other topics which once were regarded as certainly known. One of the most convincing witnesses to Jesus was the man who refused to be drawn into a theological debate, but who said, "One thing I know. Whereas I was blind, now I see." I remember engaging once in a discussion about religion with some young people in a hotel. At last an old lady who had overheard our learned talk stood up and said, "I am going to bed. I haven't the faintest idea of what you've been talking about and I couldn't begin to argue with you, but I know my Savior." Is that not a more convincing testimony than that of the person who will dare to define the relationship between the three Persons of the Trinity to a nicety and the exact mode of the Incarnation to a particle?

Let us have no hesitation in admitting to the perplexities and doubts which are the lot of the honest seeker after God in any age. Let us make common cause with our fellows in this Age of Doubt.

God asks no one for assent to blind dogmatism. He nowhere promises certainty nor all knowledge, but only enough of light to guide our steps till morning.

He who never doubted of his state,  
He may perhaps, perhaps he may  
too late.

This is something the Bible itself says over and over again.

Hear Job:

Canst thou by searching find out God?  
Canst thou find out the Almighty to  
perfection?

Or Isaiah:

The everlasting God, the Creator of  
the ends of the earth, fainteth not,  
neither is weary. *There is no search-  
ing of his understanding.*

Or St. Paul:

Here we see through a glass darkly.  
Now I know in part.

Or John:

Beloved, now are we the sons of  
God and *it doth not yet appear* what  
we shall be.

The writer to the Hebrews devotes  
most of the magnificent eleventh chap-  
ter to the praise of those who, like Abra-  
ham, went out—not knowing whither  
they went—giving faith the meaning of  
action by those who did not know  
rather than its common meaning of in-  
action by those who do know.

There is mystery at the very centre of  
our holy Faith. All the time when we  
speak about eternal things, we speak  
with words borrowed from time, and  
they do not precisely meet the case. God  
has a certain hiddenness—a sort of mod-  
esty our words cannot penetrate; the  
universe has privacies we cannot invade.  
In the Moslem Rosary there are 33 beads  
fingered three times a day, an attribute  
of God being mentioned at each. That  
makes, not one hundred, but only  
ninety-nine, for no man knows all the  
attributes of God. There are some  
things God cannot explain to us just  
as there are some things we cannot ex-  
plain to our dog or our cat.

So let us not flee from this age of  
doubt, nor disown it, nor condemn it.  
Let us identify ourselves with it and  
admit that we are part of it, as its  
doubts are part of us.

(i)

Indeed, the fact that this is an age of  
doubt is not without advantages for  
faith. It keeps our faith humble, and  
humility is a quality which is as rare  
as it is precious.

All that disfigures the history of the  
Church came from presumptuous cer-  
tainty in the souls of men—the horrors  
of the Inquisition—the fires at Smith-  
field—the hanging of the Covenanters—  
the wars of religion—the massacre of  
St. Bartholomew—the arrogance of the  
witch-hunts.

Cromwell wrote to my fellow coun-  
trymen in 1650, "I beseech you, in the  
bowels of Christ, think it possible you  
may be mistaken." This is the advantage  
of doubt, that it makes us think it pos-  
sible that we may be mistaken and so  
breeds a certain humility before God  
and a certain courtesy towards man.

(ii)

The second advantage of doubt is that  
it delivers us from the folly of defending  
too long a line. The Church is over-  
extended. We feel that we have an obli-  
gation to defend many things which are  
indefensible. We must, we feel, stand by  
everything the last General Assembly  
said. We must maintain that every line  
of the Bible is literally true. We must  
defend everything in the Westminster  
Confession and the Apostles' Creed and  
the *obiter dicta* of the Archbishop of  
Canterbury. The fatal mistake that Hit-  
ler made was to fight on several fronts

and in some areas—like the Libyan desert—to try and defend the indefensible. The Church makes the same mistake—wasting its energy in defending positions which ought to have been surrendered long ago or ought never to have been taken up. We should let modern scepticism do its work—"removing those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain" (Hebrews 12:27). Many things we hold as articles of faith are mere matters of opinion, and wrong opinion at that. Let us cut out the things we think and believe and reduce the load of beliefs that we carry to the irreducible minimum we can defend with conviction.

We must accept doubt (i) as inducing a certain humility; (ii) as driving us back to our certainties; and (iii) as forcing us to be relevant to our own times.

Preaching, somewhere cynically described as the triumphant proclamation of the obvious, has become, perhaps, more nearly in our time the impassioned declaration of the irrelevant. We are so apt to answer questions which no one is asking any more. One of the books I have not yet written and probably will never write would be called "That's a good question." Think of the great questions of the Bible.

Where are thou, Adam?

Where is thy brother?

What aileth thee, O Hagar?

What is man?

Who knoweth but that thou wert sent to the kingdom for such a time as this?

Who is this?

Who art thou, Lord?

Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?

Doubt at least makes us aware of the real questions. Our own age, as well as being the Age of Doubt, has a certain claim to be considered the most exciting, the most dangerous, and the most revolutionary of any.

The last sixty years have seen history being made at a startling pace—two Great Wars and a dozen smaller—the end of Empires: Dutch, French, Italian, Portuguese, and British. Television, radar, the aeroplane, and the computer have revolutionized our lives. Space travel has opened up new vistas.

On the other side we have seen drug-taking flare up, the atavism of the Hippies, the terrible race antagonisms, the upsurge of brutality for which we have to go back nearly 2,000 years to find a name—Vandalism.

Violence is being shown, not by savages, but by students in the most sophisticated nations in the world—Britain, Germany, Belgium, and the U.S.A. Are we, perhaps, paying for the organized violence which is war? Are the young people saying, "If you will force us to fight for your causes, then we shall choose to fight for our own"? Or has the speed of invention outpaced man's power to assimilate it? Are the young people suffering from technological indigestion, or are they drunk with power like some despot of long ago?

Certainly we must try not to judge them, but to understand them. If it is not possible to indict a nation, as Burke said, still less is it possible to indict a generation. It is so easy and so useless to condemn.

Of one thing we can be sure. Unless our Christian faith, particularly the Easter gospel at the heart of it, is shown to be relevant to 1968 and its needs and perplexities, it is not worth having. If



faith is a piece of antiquarian whimsy in which the middle-aged and elderly can take refuge from the realities of our world, it is not worth stating or defending. Well, is it—relevant, I mean?

Oddly enough, the rising of Christ was first announced to one with whom the Beatnik, Hippie generation would have felt a certain kinship—Mary Magdalene. Early in the morning on the first day of the week she went to the tomb. It was empty. "They" must for spite have taken his body away. Piteously she appealed to the man she took to be the gardener, "Sir, they have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him."

That could be the appeal of our age of doubt. "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him." This was what simple souls cried when the Reformers took away the familiar god of the biscuit on the altar and the image on the wall.

It was true in a way, but in his place came the Lord God of the Biblical record. And God was alive and real and holy for Knox and Calvin, for Bunyan and Milton and Cromwell, as he had been for the saints of the Dark Ages. It was the Living Lord they knew, these great ones, and our own Covenanters.

Came the 18th Century and the living Faith began to die, till Wesley and the Evangelicals appeared and Christ became the beloved Companion of the everyday.

And with hardly an interruption came the 19th Century with the greatest missionary expansion the world has ever seen, with John Williams, David Livingstone, and Mary Slessor.

But that age is past, and those who seek the Lord with the hymns or with the theology of the 19th Century are

seeking the living among the dead. There are many who still wander near the Victorian tombs saying, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him."

To us God says the same thing as to the first disciples, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here wher his body lay. He is risen and goes before you." Christ is not back there in the 19th Century. He is alive in 1968, just as alive as in 1868 or in 68.

In a sense Christ dies and is resurrected for every age. It is not a proof of our faith, but of our lack of it if we continue to seek him by the methods of the past in the places where our fathers laid him.

We cannot go back to the world of the 19th Century and it is pathological to want to do so. We cannot go back to the Old Time Religion of Moody and Sankey and the Shorter Catechism, and we should not want to do so. By all means learn the lessons of yesterday and the day before and last year and the whole of history. Gather up all the experience of the past so as the better to face tomorrow's challenge, but realize that it is *tomorrow* we face and not *yesterday*. Let the past be our guide but not our jailer, our shield but not our strait jacket.

This we shall do as we realize that tomorrow is not a threat nor a blank mystery, but a challenge and an opportunity; if we know that we need not face it alone—and we need not. It is full—as full as the past ever was—of the Love of God. Although the future is happily hidden from our eyes, it is not hidden from his. He is as much at home in it as in the present or in the past. God is not an old gentleman who lived long ago and died. He is more up to

date than tomorrow's news, more modern than the 21st Century.

"After I am risen I will go before you," Christ said to his disciples, and in full measure they found that to be true. Wherever they went in the Roman Empire, he was there before them, preparing the way. So have his servants found in every age—in jungle and desert, in concentration camp, in lands strange and unfamiliar, they found always that Christ was waiting almost in impatience for them to come. When he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them.

We need not be afraid of tomorrow—whatever of new knowledge and strange invention it may hold, whatever of challenge and adventure. It will be nothing new to Christ. Don't let us cling to the cosily familiar, to the tried and true. "Let us go on, if God allows," sure that nothing, neither things present nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from his love.

Some of you will remember the 1939 Christmas Broadcast of King George VI, of blessed memory:

"I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year, 'Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown.' And he replied, 'Go out into the darkness and put your hand into the hand of God. That shall be to you better than light and safer than a known way.'"

"So, heart, be still.

What need our little life,

Our human life, to know,

If God hath comprehension?"

What does tomorrow hold for you and me, for our country, for the world? Who can tell? But shall we for that

reason shrink from it in fear? No! If God allows, let us go on to face it in the assurance of his love in Jesus Christ our Lord.

I never thought I'd be sorry for the Roman Church, but I am sorry for her in our day. She is being torn apart by the sheer ill-logic of her own position, committing a sort of public spiritual hari-kari. For so long she was *semper eadem*, for far too long, so that when the pressures of truth became too strong, the seemingly unbreakable dam began to crack. Now the trickle has become a flood. This disorderly rout, this crumbling of all discipline should be a terrible warning to any who want to stay unchanging in a time of change. It is no use singing,

Give me the old time religion.  
It was good enough for Mother,  
It was good enough for Father,  
And it is good enough for me.

For we cannot reproduce the conditions and circumstances of our fathers' day. You cannot command the Household Cavalry in red coats and bearskins to ride defiantly into a hail of napalm or atomic bombs.

We must allow all the new truth available to have its impact upon us. Its first effect will be to make us feel lost in a desert from which all the dear, familiar landmarks have been removed. The vast age of the universe; the vast size of the universe; the revelations of psychology of the somewhat murky springs of our conduct in our own unconscious; the determinism of our technocracy—all increase our sense of loss. The great text for our day is, "My God, my God, why has Thou forsaken me?" Who said the "Death of God"

was news? We are all aware of what the Germans call *angst*. We have all the nightmare of being lost in a weightless, dimensionless, trackless universe of space. This, of course, is not entirely new. To this awareness the Eden story speaks. It tells us that something has gone wrong, that we have indeed lost something by our fault, our own fault, our own most grievous fault, and that our fault is a theological one. We have somehow broken our bond with God. We have put ourselves in the wrong. We have declared U.D.I. (Unilateral Declaration of Independence). We are in a state of rebellion, and from this fact all our other troubles spring. "Ye shall be as gods," said the tempter. And we fell. We saw what we thought was our chance. Stifling conscience, we did the forbidden thing. Now where once we knew the happy dependence of sons, there is only the sullen enmity of upstarts.

If this diagnosis of our ailment is right, it might seem that the obvious thing to do is to go back, back to the innocence we once knew. Let us reverse the process which has ended in such tragedy and sorrow. Let us cast off the fig leaves and play once again in the Garden of God. But when we retrace our steps to Eden we find the cherubims and the flaming sword turning every way to keep the way of the tree of life. There is no way back to our lost innocence. The adolescent cannot unlearn what he has come to know of the fierce passions within him. There is no way back to carefree infancy. The teen-age young lady will never be a little girl again.

In the legend, the Lady of Shalott was happy and contented with the images in

the mirror; but one day, seeing bold Sir Launcelot,

She left the web, she left the loom,  
She made three paces through the room,  
She saw the water-lily bloom,  
She saw the helmet and the plume,  
She looked down to Camelot.

Out flew the web and floated wide,  
The mirror cracked from side to side,  
"The curse is come upon me", cried  
The Lady of Shalott.

There was no turning back to the images.

What has once been discovered cannot be forgotten. This is the kind of truth idealists and romanticists too often ignore. Despite the enthusiasm of the campaigners for Nuclear Disarmament, we cannot dis-invent the atomic bomb nor wipe Hiroshima from the history books.

There may have been that in our own past lives which we would give a lot not to have happened, but

The Moving Finger writes and,  
having writ,  
Moves on; nor all thy Piety nor  
Wit

Shall lure it back to cancel  
half a line,  
Nor all thy Tears wash out a  
Word of it.

The Eden of our lost innocence lies behind us. We shall not enter it again. And God does not ask us to try. He never asks us to go backward, but always forward. He never asks us to act in despair, but always in the hopefulness of new life in Christ. "Except a man be born again," said Christ, "he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Nicodemus saith unto him, "How can a man be born



when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Of course not! But Jesus asks no man to be unborn, to reverse the whole process of growing up. He asks him to emerge into a new kind of life. "Except a man be born of water and the spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." The new life in Christ is not the old life of innocence nor its successor, the life of guilt. It is a new life, more developed than either. Luther, watching his children squabbling, said, "So we must become as little children? Lord, this is too much. We cannot be such idiots." But Jesus does not ask us to be childish. He takes us as we are, with all our experiences, with all our knowledge, all our lost innocence—aye, with all our mistakes and failures and sins—and by the miracle of his pardoning grace finally fits us for Heaven. The Prodigal Son would never again be the happy lad who had played at his father's feet, but when he came to himself he went back to a meal made sweeter by his memories of the husks he had shared with the pigs.

It's a long road from Genesis to Revelation, from Eden to Paradise, from Innocence to the Forgiveness of Sins. It meant the birth and life and death of the Son of God before the promise could be given. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God."

But that promise is for sinners like you and me. Let us not hark back to the good old days, nor long for an Eden we do not need, we who have the promise of Paradise. There *is* no road back. But there is a way forward in Christ, on to the City of God. No cherubims with flaming sword bar that road, for

the gates of that city "shall not be shut at all," and in the midst is the tree of life for which we hunger, and its leaves are for the healing of the nations; and there shall be no more curse and His servants shall serve him and they shall see his face.

We cannot go backward to Eden. Why should we try to when we *can* go forward to the City of God? We have been promised the Holy Spirit, not to leave us nor to keep us, but to lead us into all truth; and whichever way He leads, it is never backward.

So let us thank God for the past and take courage for the future. Let us not try rudely to shout down the protagonists of new truth. Let us expose ourselves to all that they have to say and let us not seek to hold on to any position which we know in our heart of hearts to be finally untenable.

This, then, is the third great benefit which accrues to faith from the fact that this is an Age of Doubt. It forces us to be relevant.

In our dealings with the world we must take full account of the changes that have occurred, neither ignoring them nor fleeing from them. In particular, we must ensure that we are not indulging in a kind of double talk, using words in one sense which our hearers understand in another. Language and ideas change continually, and it is of no more use presenting the Gospel in the language of Victorian England than in presenting it in Yugoslav or Double Dutch. Half of the time people are saying, "No," not to the Gospel, but to a distortion or caricature or misunderstanding of it. Similarly, and perhaps more seriously, a great number of people are saying, "Yes," not to the Gospel, but to their own mis-

conception of it. Our job as preachers should be so to state the Gospel that it is not misunderstood. This may turn some away from the Church who at present sit cosily enough in the pews, but it will probably bring others in who meantime do not come near.

### A.

What, then, are we to say to the world? What is to be the content of our preaching? What can we declare, in Luke's words, as those things which are most surely believed among us?

We have seen that we live in an Age of Doubt and that it is by no means all loss. As we have seen, it serves to keep us humble, to restrict us to a proper limitation of our field of enquiry, and to demand from us a certain degree of relevance. Yet doubt can just as easily lead to despair as to faith. When everyone else is telling of their doubts, the Church should be telling more clearly of the certainties—however limited these may be in number.

Most people do not need to be argued with. They need to be helped. As Ian McLaren said, "Be kind, for most people are having a hard struggle." J. B. Phillips, in the Preface to "The Ring of Truth," tells a pathetic story of a clergyman, old and retired, who took his own life because his reading of the New Theology drove him—lonely and ill—to the conclusion that his own life's work had been founded on a lie. We have an obligation, not only to speak the truth, but to speak it in love and to take into account what possible hearers may take out of what we say.

Words do not have a universal solid meaning. They are colored by our experience. Consider, for example, how differently we all react even to the

simple word "Father," depending on our own experience as sons or daughters. Every time a verb is used, it changes its meaning to suit the subject of it. Take the common verb "to sing," for example. Does it mean the same thing when I say that I sing and that Joan Sutherland sings? Mothers love. Sweethearts love. Children love. Patriots love. In each case the word "love" means something different.

So let us be careful when we voice our doubts, lest we be misunderstood. Let us take nothing away unless we are ready to put something else in its place. Let the wind of change blow about us, let the solvent acids of modernity cut away all that is useless, but do not let us placard our doubts continually. People have enough of their own. There has been too much denigration of the Church by the Church; too much crying of "stinking fish"; too much beating of the breast; too much cutting of ourselves with knives. Without denying that many things can be doubted, let us declare the things which cannot possibly be doubted, the things that remain. Let us make less of the things we do not see and assert plainly such things as we do see.

At first sight this may seem to be going back on what has already been said about this being an Age of Doubt, and about the usefulness of doubt, and our need to identify ourselves with our age—but there are limits.

(1) We cannot remain forever on the fence on every topic. Nature abhors a vacuum. I cannot leave everything an open question; when to get up, whether to go to work, what paper to buy, or what to have for breakfast. In a provisional way at least, some things must be regarded as settled. Doubt cannot

be continuous. It is necessarily fluid and is forever moving towards denial or affirmation. Every belief is either growing in certainty or diminishing in certainty.

(2) Because of this an attempt to keep all beliefs in a state of suspended animation, hanging like Mahomet's coffin between heaven and earth, can lead only to a sudden descent into an unthinking dogmatism of the left or the right. Witness the spread of extreme right wing religion among students. We must have some pegs to hang our coats on—some beliefs to hang our doubts on.

(3) As a missionary or apologetic necessity, we must have some agreed-on facts to form a basis of dialogue. We cannot discuss a matter with someone with whom we have nothing in common.

### B.

Is there any such common ground? In our dealings with the world, are there any things we can point to as sure? I think there are several.

First: the *Fact of Christ*. There have been and are disputes about the nature of Christ and the work of Christ, but no one seriously doubts that a man, Jesus of Nazareth, was in fact born about 1,930 years ago. Nor are the main facts of his life nor the general tenor of his teaching in dispute. Nobody doubts the sort of person Jesus was. Equally impossible is it to deny the impact of his personality on the history of the world and on the life of our times. Some, like Swinburne, may deplore it:

Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilean.  
The world has grown grey at Thy  
breath.

But none can deny it. Is there any other

person, alive or dead, who can even be spoken of in the same breath? His advent fixes the year in which we live. The Cross on which he died is found in some form or other in almost every street in every city in the world. Here is a Person who towers over every other individual who lives or ever has lived, who dwarfs giants like Buddha and Mahomet, with whom Darwin, Marx and Freud cannot even begin to be compared for width and weight of influence. This is not a claim of faith. It is a fact of history, a fact of sociological observation. The last issue of the New York Times I picked up had six items of news which referred to Christ. He is the foremost figure in the world, and curiously few would have it otherwise. It is odd how often non-Church-goers judge Church-goers by reference to Christ: "I'm as good a follower of Christ as those who go to Church." In debate with opponents of the Gospel, do not let yourself be forced into discussions of peripheral matters. Keep Christ in the foreground. Here is One who, amidst much that is perplexing, is as the center piece of the jig-saw of life. "We see not all things, but we see Jesus. . . ." (Hebrews 2:8 and 9).

Second: the *Fact of the Bible*. Much has changed in the past 1,500 years. One thing has remained the same—the Bible. In all that period no books have been added to it and none has been taken away. From time to time scholars have fought about a word or phrase, but none of these proposed corrections would alter it in any important particular. Since the invention of printing it has been translated, in whole or in part, into 1,326 languages, so bringing into the realm of the possible the vision of Erasmus that every ploughman in the

field and every weaver at the loom should be able to read the Word of God for himself. In our day there have been the translations into contemporary English which have made such an impact on those who were beginning to find the stately language of the Authorised Version hard to understand. In 1967 104,805,805 Bibles or Bible portions were distributed by the Bible Societies. That, of course, does not include the Trade figures. The income of the Bible Societies comes to \$5,400,000.00. The Bible remains the greatest book in the world—the Best Seller of all best sellers. It is owned by more people, read by more people, quoted by more people in more languages than any other book. Continually we use phrases from the Bible without fully realising it—faint yet pursuing; fatted calf; prodigal; talents; good Samaritan.

Milton and Shakespeare, Bach and Rembrandt, Dante and Handel—all require the Bible to explain them. All of this cannot be gainsaid. These are all facts which an honest man must admit, whether he admits that the Bible is the Inspired Word of God or not.

Countless millions in every age have found it to be that too, but this we cannot prove except to those who will with prayer give themselves to the reading of it.

Without the Church, of course, the Bible would never have existed, never have been preserved, and would not now be read.

Third: the *Fact of the Church*. Let the core of religion be a living Faith in a Personal God. Such a faith must have some outward and visible expression. Human love that ends in profound emotion, but is never spoken of nor institutionalised into a home is pale,

vapid stuff. Patriotism which does not lead to service of our country is self-delusion.

So although Christ founded no Church, the movement he began has in every age and in every land found institutional embodiment in a Church. It does not much matter which one. It probably ought to vary from place to place and from age to age, but always it will take shape in some form of Church. The existence, the persistence, the growth of the Church are facts of profound importance.

There is no doubt about it. The Church is a fact. We cannot doubt its existence nor, to judge even from numbers alone, its significance in the world. Men have been predicting its disappearance for a long time. Celsus, one of its earliest critics, was sure that it was on its last legs. He was wrong, as has been many another who forecast that the Church was just about finished. She is an anvil that has worn out many hammers. She shows every sign of fulfilling Christ's prophecy that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Most folk, even if they do not go to Church very often, would be glad of it. While quick to criticise the undoubted faults of the Church, they would not be happy to see it disappear. They want it to be there to complain about and to stay away from! Say to almost any of the Church's critics, "All right! We'll abolish the Church by law, take down all places of worship, mark the big events of life—birth, marriage and death—by a Registrar's Certificate." Suggest that kind of thing and many a rabid opponent of the Church will hesitate. But they need not worry. There is no danger of the Church disappearing for lack of support—not even in Russia or Red China.



Indeed, I was told recently by a Churchman, who had just spent six weeks in China, that the Church there has never been stronger. Throughout the world the picture is the same. The last century has seen the greatest expansion in numbers that the Church has ever known. At this moment there are about 600 million Christians in the world.

Last Sunday, as every Sunday, a fair proportion of the 600 million were at Church and dropped a total of \$36,000,000.00 into plates, bags and boxes—in dollars and cents, in shillings and pence, in kroner and copecks, in pfenings and I know not what. Forty-five per cent of Americans are in Church every Sunday, and there has been an upturn in attendances recently for the first time in ten years. In my own country last year, a larger amount was contributed by its members to the Church of Scotland than ever before in its history. If money talks, here are some clear things that money says:

*Income of Church of Scotland. Per Head.*

1930	£1,856,295	£1: 9: 2
1950	£1,826,087	£1: 8: 1
1960	£4,810,050	£3:14:—
1966	£6,357,430	£5: 3:—

The last annual increase of \$1 per head being the greatest ever.

Now all of this may sound like smug self-satisfaction, and it could easily lead to that. But it need not and should not do so. It should lead to a kind of sober gratitude as a basis for further effort. But—and this is the point—these facts about the Church are facts, not matters of opinion, but hard, incontrovertible facts.

Those of us who belong to the Church, therefore, are not a dwindling handful, as some would suggest. We are members of the greatest society that

history has ever known, international, inter-racial, of every class and shade of political opinion. Say "Our Father"—even these two simple words—and realise as you say them that these same two words are being spoken in every language at every moment of the day by some of the 600,000,000 people who make up the church.

As o'er each continent and island

The sun leads on another day,  
The voice of prayer is never silent,  
Nor fades the sound of praise away.

So be it, Lord, Thy Church shall never,  
Like earth's proud empires, pass away.  
Thy Kingdom stands and grows for ever,  
Till all Thy creatures own Thy sway.

How incredibly impoverished our culture would be if everything we owe to Christian influence were removed from it! Nearly all the great movements of social amelioration were due to people of profound religious faith—Elizabeth Fry, William Wilberforce, Keir Hardie, and many another. How much of the best in art and music and architecture has sprung from Christian roots and is impregnated with the Christian Faith!

These arguments will seem to be somewhat tenuous to those who crave a scientifically proved God, or at least one who is self-evident. I do not know anyone who has come unaided to an unmediated knowledge of God. I do not believe that our certainty of his existence is an objective certainty at all; nor do I believe his existence to be self-evident. Kant found the Starry Heavens above and the Moral Law within to be sufficient proof, but some there are who no longer marvel at the Starry Heavens nor

admit to an awareness of the Moral Law. The framers of the Declaration of Independence on July 4th, 1776, asserted bravely:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident:  
That all men are created equal;  
That all men have certain inalienable rights.  
Amongst these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

But there are not many who would contend that it is self-evident that all men are created equal or that their rights are inalienable. No doubt the traditional proofs of the existence of God—cosmological, teleological, ontological—have their value as a preparation for the Gospel. I do not believe that they are logically watertight or that the God they lead to is recognisably the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. I do not regard it as a pity that God's existence cannot be proved, for if we could demonstrate God's existence, we would be master of God instead of him over us. Besides, simply to believe that there is a God is nothing. The devils also believe and tremble. To give pallid assent to the fact that there is Someone Somewhere is not faith.

Faith is not a coldly intellectual assent to right doctrine. It is a warm commitment of oneself in love and truth and obedience. When the disciples first came to know Jesus, they had no faith in him. That came first when he said, "Follow me," and they followed.

While the objective certainties of which we have spoken may re-inforce faith or make scepticism more difficult, they cannot procure faith any more than can the arguments for God's existence. Faith will come only when we ourselves

rise up and follow as did those whom first Christ called.

### C.

So we come to what seem to me to be the surest rocks on which to stand in the midst of the swirling tides of this age of doubt—those of personal conviction, commitment, experience and witness, and into all of this I am led by Christ.

From College days you will remember the argument of Descartes—*Dubito ergo sum*. I doubt, therefore I am. I am aware of myself and my doubts. As soon as I am aware of myself as a self-existent being, I am forced to go on to ask the crucial questions of our age:

Who am I?  
What is man?

Is he a creature, august in origin, noble in destiny? Or is he a chance collection of atoms with self-consciousness on top like a dunce's cap on a circus donkey? Are man's hopes and dreams and prayers a slightly comic addition to his real self—a mean and vindictive ape? Or was man long before his entry into the world conceived in the heart of God—purposed to be his child for ever?

Man—an atomic accident or a child of the most high God? This is the crucial question on the answer to which all other questions—religious, political, economic, moral—depend.

Let it be admitted that there is a lot to be said for the atomic accident theory. Our bodies are material, of the same stuff as the earth we live in. "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." We are blood relations of all that breathe, with the same chemistry and largely the same physiology. Biology

treats of every form of life from the sand fly up to the man of genius. We eat and drink and breathe like the beasts of the field and reproduce our kind. Subject to the same diseases, we finally yield to the same death. That explains a lot about man—his self-assertiveness, his lusts, his brutality. It explains a whole lot about most of us. Most days our behaviour could be explained as the behaviour of an intelligent ape. We work to get food and drink. We eat and drink. We play a little, not unlike the lambs in the field or the monkeys in the trees, and then we sleep.

But some days it's different. In the book *Born Free*, the story of the lion cub brought up in captivity, well enough content with its lot, being a kind of huge tabby cat, till some call came from the wild—its real and native place—and a restlessness arose within it that not all its comforts or its new-found human friends, not even the food in plenty, could satisfy. So with us—well content to be as the beasts of the field, eating and sleeping and clumsily playing, until something touches our hearts and we know it is not enough.

"Fie, Fie," cried Sam Rutherford, "this is not my country." Do you remember Hadad? "Let me depart that I may go to my own country" (I Kings 11:21.). We may not know what it is that tugs at our heart strings, may try to stifle our longings. We eat the more. We drink the more. We turn up the television, throw ourselves into work. But nothing can quite still the longing in our hearts, the restlessness in our souls.

What starts our heavenly discontents? What makes it impossible for us to believe that we are a chance assortment of atoms due soon for disintegration? The

beauty of a flower or a song can do it—or someone's death; the serious look of a child, the gentle laughter of an aged friend. And all at once we know that this is not all, that we are meant for other things and better things than to eat and sleep and die.

Look at the underside of a piece of needlework and it is just a tangle of material, of threads that lead nowhere. On the upper side the pattern is plain and we see the meaning and beauty of it. From beneath we have the appearance of one of the animals. Looked at from above, we have the lineaments of God.

Our family are not notable as singers, but one of our boys was once in a choir. We were there, putting up with the other classes, till the great moment arrived. Forty small boys appeared. There he was—his tie askew. We had eyes for no other. To the conductor he was one of the crowd. But he was our son.

From the underside, from the point of view of science, man is one of the beasts, a mammal, a vertebrate. But as God looks at the range and spread of nature, he picks out man as his son. And the proof of this is Christ our Lord.

It might be that you and I could be squeezed into the same class as the brutes that perish, but never Christ. "Behold the Man," said Pilate, and he was that—fully and truly human. But "Surely this *Man* was the *Son of God*," said the Centurion, feeling and knowing that here was One who was surely Divine. And he was one of us. In him God's purpose is fulfilled and man's destiny is revealed.

In some sort already we are God's children. His purpose in Christ is that we shall be fully his. So, God created



man in his own image. "In the image of God created he him: male and female created he them." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God. And it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is, and shall at last be satisfied."

So as I look at Christ—my fellow Man—I am aware of myself and I am certain that I was not born to die. I believe his promise, "I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there ye may be also." Through Christ I come to know myself—who I am, what I am, whither I go. This does not, of course, tell me how I became as I am. There are two questions we can ask about anything. Of what? For what? The first is no doubt interesting. The second is vital. Is the spoon silver or E.P.N.S. or Sheffield plate? I don't care. I know what it is for. Is this desk I stand at custom-built of teak or mass-produced of pine? I don't know or care. I know what it is for. Was I evolved out of some sort of monkey? I neither know nor care. It is at least as fancy to be made out of a monkey as to be made out of dust. (Incidentally, why do we speak of descent from monkeys? Ascent would surely be a little more flattering!) Whether from monkeys or not, in Christ I know that I am made for God.

Christ, who knew what was in the heart of man, never thought meanly or spoke slightly of him. Neither should we.

We should not be taken in by the fallacy of size. The universe is big, but I know it and it does not know me. I live for only three score years and ten. Do I? I can project myself back to Greece and Rome and Egypt, and forward to everlastingness. I am assailed

by doubts, but it is I who does the doubting. In some sort I contain the world that contains me. Above all, I am of the same flesh as Christ and, however far I have gone astray, I am of the same origin and with the same high destiny.

In Christ I come to a new awareness of myself as a son of God, to a new conviction that I was not born by accident finally to die.

But it is not only to a new awareness of myself as a child of God that Christ brings me, but to a new awareness of my neighbour.

In Christ I learn that my neighbour is not only the person next door or over the back wall, but the person on the other side of the railroad tracks, on the other side of the world.

In the story of the Good Samaritan, the crucial phrase is, "He came where he was." This was what was wrong with the Priest. He passed by on the other side. The Levite looked at him. Only the Samaritan came where he was. So long as we do not really look at him, or look at him only from a distance in condescension as a being inferior to ourselves, he will not move us. Only if we come where he is—he being the child, the delinquent, the student, the Negro, the person in need—do we learn to love and to serve him.

How do we learn to do this? From him who came where we are, who became the Man for us, who made himself our neighbour. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" does not mean "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as much as thou lovest thyself." It means "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as one like thyself." This is what Jesus did. He loved us as one like himself.

In Christ I know myself.

In Christ I know my neighbour.

Lastly, in Christ, and not otherwise, I come to know God.

Of course there are other hints within me of my origin and destiny in God. My discomfort in sin. To do good tastes better. My feeling of what Otto calls "the holy" before the grandeur of the hills or the restless immensity of the sea; the longing for Eternity which has no sense in it if there be no Eternity to long for. It would be curious if we were equipped with a longing for a God who were not there and for an everlastingness which does not exist.

But all of this leads to an inclination to believe in God rather than a compulsion. The compulsion I come to, at least, only when in the Upper Room I stand with Thomas and hear Christ say, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands and thrust thy hand into my side, and be not faithless but believing." It is then that I am driven to my knees and to cry out, "My Lord and my God." I do not know a God other than Christ, greater than Christ, apart from Christ. But in Christ I cannot doubt him.

"No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him."

No one will pass from doubt to faith because of the cleverness of our arguments, but only as we are ready to testify of Christ. "Come see a Man," said the woman at the well. She was not a good woman, nor a clever one, but many believed because of the saying of the woman. Though John the Baptist did no miracle, he spoke of Christ, and men testified that all he said about Christ was true.

All of this, of course, yields a certainty of a sort different from that which science yields, but it is not for

that reason inferior to it. My assurance of my wife's love is not scientifically provable. Indeed, if I were to submit it to some sort of proof, I would bid fair to destroy it. But I am certain of it just the same. It is a personal conviction away beyond any that science could give—personal rather than subjective. Subjective has a faintly pejorative tinge, almost equal to mistaken or illusory. My knowledge of my wife is not subjective. She is perfectly real. Nor is it objective. She is not a proper object for my investigation or manipulation. The very essence of immorality is to treat another person as a thing. My knowledge of my wife is neither subjective nor objective, but personal. She is not a thing nor an illusion, but a person who affects me at least as much as I affect her. My relationship with her is not an I—I, a relationship of myself with me; nor, in Buber's phrase, an I—it, a relationship of myself with a thing; but an I—thou, a relationship of myself with a person.

And of this sort is my relationship with God. God is not an illusion, nor is he the object of my knowledge. He is Personal in the highest degree. I cannot prove his existence, nor is he a denizen of my private dream world. He exists independent of my knowing, but if and in so far as I have personal experience of God in Christ and find that experience challenging, comforting, satisfying, I must invite others to share it with me. This I take it is what preaching is—an attempt to effect an introduction between one's hearers whom one sees and the God whom one has come to know in Christ. This also dictates the nature of faith. It is not knowledge of truth, nor assent to doctrine, nor is it obedience to a command. It is personal relationship. From this relationship all

else flows—increasing knowledge of the truth, increasing awareness of God's Will and obedience to it, and a growing eagerness to share God with others. Denney once said, "Some people do not believe in missions. They have no right to believe in missions. They do not believe in Christ." But once we enter into the personal relationship to Christ in which faith consists, we cannot keep it to ourselves. Inevitably it will show. There is no doubt about it that the most convincing argument for Christianity and the most certain proof of its truth are the lives of those who live with Christ.

And, finally, nothing else tells but the changed life, for dead men work no miracles and Christ gives proof of his life and power in each life that is changed.

These, then, are the personal convictions which I can invite my hearers to share; and some will believe because of the testimony of our words and lives—however imperfect and stuttering our utterance may be:

1. My experience of myself—in Christ.
2. My experience of others—in Christ.
3. My experience of God—in Christ.

Do not let us seek to defend the indefensible. Let the world doubt all that can fairly be doubted, and let the world's doubts have their properly asurgent impact on our flabby theology.

But what we owe to the world and what the world longs for is to know of the things most surely believed among us. There are enough of these, and far more than enough, to provide a haven of sanity in a world gone mad. Let others prate of their doubts. Let us begin with the objective certainties of Christ, The Bible, The Church, and the fruit of these in the world; and go on to the personal certainties of myself, my neighbour and my God in Christ our Lord.

Life is short and uncertain. Baxter's advice to preach as a dying man to dying men may seem grim, but it has sense in it. When we preach or lecture or write, there will be among those to whom we address ourselves some who will have no other chance on earth. Some day it will be for us the last chance we shall have to testify of the Truth as it has been given to us. We dare not be silent. We dare not lie. We dare not chatter about trifles. For one day we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of God.

A traveller to Scotland in the Covenanting times once told of three preachers he had heard, one of whom showed him all the majesty of God, another of whom showed him all his heart, but the third spoke of the loveliness of Christ.

And Christ is the preacher's theme; and he—not the applause of men, nor the esteem of our fellows—he is our exceeding great reward.

# The Minister as Politician

CHARLES H. BAYER

A FEW years ago a fistful of books, papers, and assorted speeches began to appear taking on the parish for not being a viable institution in today's world. This fistful soon became an avalanche which inundated every sector of American church life. Groups of students would gather in restrooms in seminaries and giggle over the latest parish obscenities—and there were, and are, plenty of them. Any young man who was thinking of going into the parish ministry was written off as a poor insipid dum-dum. In parishes numbers of young ministers, unhappy with the whole thing anyhow, exercised a unique kind of masochism and with every blow cried with glee, "That feels so good, hit me again!" Others in better mental health just quit.

Needless to say, men who spent their lives in parishes took a dim view of the unhappy scene and began to squawk like a flock of ducks under a shotgun assault. Books, papers, and speeches defending the parish as God's irreplaceable gift and the only real church began to appear. These defenses of the church go on and on—*ad ridiculum, ad infinitum, ad nauseam*.

I am not here today to pound the parish. Its own ineptness is enough to make any case against it that needs to be made. Neither am I here to offer a theological defense of the parish nor to suggest religious reasons why men ought to train for its ministry. I would like to take, however, a cold hard un-theological, unromantic, non-religious look at it. I will not ask such questions

as: Can it be dragged back to life? Is worship as we have known it at all relevant in today's world? Don't we need somebody to comfort the afflicted? These may be good questions but peripheral to what I have to say. *The real question I want to raise is whether the parish is useable by God as he works out his purposes in history, and I mean by that politically useable.* I will answer that question, yes, and then suggest that I was being a bit facetious a moment ago because to ask the question in that way is at the heart of what the theology of the church must be about in our day.

I presuppose my stance as the assumption that God is active today breaking open history for us and calling his people to a radical, indeed a revolutionary, reshaping of social structures. If you don't see God as that kind of God and his activity in our age as that kind of activity, then most of what I say is going to sound pretty stupid. My position is that the old, stodgy, irrelevant institution called the church is not only a useable tool but a powerful and important tool in God's revolutionary strategy.

## I. The Political Power of the Church

First, let me try to document the political power of the church—that is the power to mobilize men and money to affect social change.

The church is big business. It is a wealthy institution. It is wealthier than General Motors, General Electric, and General Foods all put together—far bigger. Outside the United States government it is the wealthiest institution



in the nation. It is the nation's largest single private holder of real estate, the biggest investor, and the most significant speculator. Only the most naive woolgatherers—of which the church is full—fail to see that massive amounts of money mean massive concentration of power. There is a renewal school that sees church property as an evil thing and would encourage the church to sell off everything it owns, give its money to the poor, *à la* the request made of the rich young ruler, and set about "spiritual" pursuits. In this kind of an age it is my conviction that the Lord of the church is calling his people to use this economic power in politically effective ways.

The church's political clout cannot only be seen in its economic power, but also in its numerical strength. Even with the leveling off of church membership, still the church is the most massive organization in the nation in terms of sheer numbers. It is far larger than either political party and even more populous than the rolls of government employees. While it is true that the average churchman isn't ready to become a social revolutionary and fails to see much relationship between his political point of view and his religious affirmation, yet I am convinced that there is within every congregation a sizeable group of people who are ready to move out and make a difference in society.

## II. *The Minister as the Key to the Political Power of the Church*

Now I would like to argue what is obvious if you grant my first point: that the minister is the key to the political power of the church. Like a sleeping giant the church holds this power and

does not know it. It is largely an unused resource. There are those who would argue that it is unuseable because the church is full of reactionaries and therefore its power is most often used on behalf of the demonic dehumanizing forces in society—that it is the chaplain for the *status quo*. We would have to agree that this is largely true. Even so, I am convinced that our churches are full of hungry, ready people, desperately hungry and desperately ready, who have looked to the church for leadership and help, but have found the church so totally unable or unwilling to take the world seriously that they have opted out.

Where is this leadership to come from? Who is it that can mobilize the church and lead it to a reorientation of its potential power? Brothers and sisters, if this job is not done by the parish clergy it will not be done.

As I talk with large numbers of ministers I find that most of them want to play this role as desperately as the church and the Lord of the world need them to play it, but they do not. Why? Because they have been convinced by their protestant, puritan, individualistic, pietistic background—by all their religious and sociological conditioning that politics is a dirty word and has no place in the church. Our seminaries do not prepare men for this task. Our churches do not make it easy or convenient for men to play it and the internal life of our congregations is usually so ordered that power rests with the most conservative people—among Disciples of Christ, for example, the elders, who are elected in most churches because they are the most pious men around, which ordinarily means the most conservative. There may be courses taught in seminaries on church polity, but I haven't

seen one yet on church politics—and what good is it to understand the organization of a church if you are never provided any of the skills to change the organization or release its potential power for good?

We have millions of people in our parishes who are starving to death for want of a faith that meets the needs of these times, and we are not feeding them. Too much our clergy is dominated by dainty men, who are more accustomed to coffee hours than they are to confrontation—tea sippers, back slappers, conflict avoiders who tip-toe around their communities on the way to this ladies' meeting or on the way from that club luncheon or lodge meeting where the town bigots and "status-quoers" tell each other what a great bunch of guys they are.

We ministers have got to know how politics works; how social changes take place; how decisions are made and implemented; how money is used. And my friends by and large we are a group of political illiterates. Many of us have the will to work. We have the resources to work. What we lack is the political sophistication.

Politics is not a dirty word or a dirty business. We have got to get rid of that notion. It is the art of taking what is available and mobilizing it to get done what you want done. And there isn't anything dirty or underhanded about that. I lived for twelve years in Washington, D.C., where I had occasion to deal with political figures and I would take the political people I know and stack them up against the churchmen I know any time.

Now politics is played in the church, both denominationally and congregationally, all the time, and those who play

it are often very clever. But they never call it politics and never indicate that that is the name of the game. The difference between denominational politicians and secular politicians is that the latter admit that is what they are playing and invite all into the struggle, while the former pretend that they are not and insist that others who play it are using less than Christian or honorable tactics.

### *III. The Parish Minister Must Be Sophisticated Politically at Intra-Congregational, Inter-Congregational, and Extra-Congregational Levels*

It is clear that the minister must understand congregational process. This does not mean that he becomes a manipulator of people. It doesn't mean that he rides roughshod over people. Any politician who does not genuinely love his people, listens to what they have to say and responds to their real needs does not last very long and is not going to be very effective in any good cause. What we do not need in the church are radical demagogues. It does mean that he opens up congregational life so that men and resources can be rechanneled. It does mean that he enables those who are ready to move out, to move out. It does mean that he finds ways to redeploy the resources of the church. It does mean that he is the kind of a teacher who cannot only point directions but march with those he leads.

What is true of intra-congregational politics is also true of denominational politics. I have not the time to go into what is currently happening in the brotherhood, but what I do see is a group of young men—and some not so young, who are currently deeply involved in conversations about how to

provide political alternatives in denominational life.

I happen to trust our denominational leadership. They are honorable men. They are trapped because the only people who put pressure on them to any extent are on the right wing—like the Atlanta Declaration group. What they must have is a reputable political group on the left. Disciples for Mission and Renewal will be moving in that direction—but that is another speech which I will be glad to give at the drop of the latest copy of the Provisional Design.

What would happen if at a convention there were really two slates of officers presented, or if a major agency found that its nominees in its self-perpetuating system were challenged, or if there were organized a major effort to call into question the point of view of one of its major program divisions? Why that would scandalize the brotherhood! You see there is a built-in protection for the religious politicians who make the real decisions. And as long as seminaries produce class after class of young men who do not understand what is really happening and who allow this non-political fiction to go on forever there will be no major breakthrough. Again my point—the key is the parish minister. Nobody outside the structure is going to affect it and with our damnable clericalism no group of laymen can get effectively organized—least of all the Christian Men's Fellowship.

Let me say about Restructure, that I learned what denominational politics is about in that body. I have served on the Commission from the beginning. I believe I was the youngest member appointed to it and I am almost forty—which says something about the mind set of our leadership. I'm all for Restruc-

ture and all for the Provisional Design, but I think we would have to admit that we really haven't said or done anything very new or fresh or creative in it, but only cautiously did some reorganization of national agencies and adopted a form that other denominations have long since tried and found wanting. Those of us who were caustically called "the renewal boys" just didn't have the political smarts to get very far and so we were clobbered—as inept politicians should be.

The battle we fought is over, but I am banking on the current seminary crop to learn the political lesson in a way we never did. What we need all across our nation is a good dose of student power from the ranks of the Seminaries. And that means organized student power which will be vocal and sophisticated and which can exercise an amazing corrective to some of the problems in denominational life. If this starts to go on in the seminaries while others of us are busy opening up nominating procedures and plugging where we can for the massive redeployment of men and money to meet the real needs that the Lord of the church has placed before his people in our age—then in ten years we may see happen what the renewal boys never got to happen in the 'sixties. My fear is that ten years may be too late.

Now having talked about congregational politics and denominational politics, let me move to the real issue—secular politics. The reason we want congregations to be reordered and denominational life to be reshaped is because the real battles are in the world and we are not geared up to meet them. Let this be perfectly clear. The real issue is not church renewal. That is only a means, a tool. Perhaps we ought to quit

talking about the renewal of the church because the real issue is the renewal of the world. We play the first two games so that we can effectively play the third.

We stand on the threshold of an age that has the potential to humanize life on this planet. While being realistic about human nature and while staying out of the traps into which the old liberalism fell there is massive evidence that God is already speaking some new word to the world and that this word is currently being acted out in revolutionary terms.

If the church is to be participant and not spectator or chaplain to what God is doing then it must not only learn that politics is not a nasty word, it must be prepared to play it and play it hard. The church has got to get itself involved in politics up to its neck. We have to get rid of the illusion—which is just a rewrite of the docetic heresy—that Christianity is a spiritual religion and that the church should stay out of non-spiritual affairs. Those who pander this point of view are heretics. They have missed the gospel. Christianity is an incarnational faith, not merely a spiritual faith. Jesus came in the flesh and those who deny that he came in the flesh have missed the point. For too long we have let them hide behind a false piety and have allowed them to take all the areas of life which they don't want God messing in, label them "politics" and say "tsh! tsh!" when these areas of life are confronted with the clear demands of the gospel.

Secular politics is all about what happens to people as they confront the powers and principalities and that confrontation was enjoined by Christ the Lord from the very beginning of his ministry at the synagogue in Nazareth.

#### IV. *Some Recent Illustrations from One Congregation*

I wish I had time to describe for you the kinds of things the congregation I serve has been involved in in recent days, but I do not. Very briefly: a score of our people have been working all summer in a large south side youth project which has involved us day in and day out with the Blackstone Rangers of McClelland committee fame. Now it is no secret that the administration of Mayor Daley and his police department want to destroy the Rangers. We are currently up to our necks in a desperately important political controversy which we must win. The stakes are very high. What is at stake is an open society or a police state on the south side.

We operate in our church<sup>1</sup> a youth center and university coffeehouse to which from 300 to 800 people come every day. Because it is a center of radical political activity this has opened the gates for all kinds of troubles. We have been raided when the police acted without warrant on an anonymous tip. One by one we have seen young men who stand in the train of Bill Coffin and Dr. Spock arrested—and this very hour a dear friend of mine is being tried and will surely be sentenced to prison for five years by the time I return home—and I am feeling more than a bit guilty for not being at his side today.

Yesterday I spent all morning in court because two weeks ago a group of our youth were arrested ten minutes after they shared in the Communion of the Lord's Supper with the congregation. Theirs was an act of civil disobedience and they should have been arrested, but

<sup>1</sup> University Church of Disciples of Christ, Chicago, Illinois.



they are part of the generation of young people who are going to make a difference in this land and having given up on the church long ago they are now finding that the church is really ready to stand by them even if it doesn't agree with their methods. Many of us are convinced that we must begin to share in the building of a viable political alternative in Chicago, and throughout the land. If I was not convinced of this before, I became convinced of it during the recent Democratic convention. I was choked by tear gas. I saw people brutally beaten. I went down to try and evacuate the injured. I have talked with students I trust, and believe their stories of unthinkable brutality. I have seen their scars and bandages and I have seen their blood. And the church cares about them.

I never get involved in these things alone. For some of the same people I see in church on Sunday morning I see involved in these vital issues every other day of the week. I am beginning to know the real meaning of soul power. I am beginning to be taught what it really means when people stand together and sing, "Ain't nobody goin' to turn me around!" Just think of what could happen in this land if even a small segment

of the church got hold of that much real religion!

Yes, I'm enthused about the parish, because that is still the place where the action is. It is still the institution that educates, trains, equips, calls out, sets aside, commissions and sends out the young men and women who are going to make the difference in this land—just check any list of the creative people and you will realize this. All through western history it has been churchmen who have manned the movements for land reform, the rights of labor, civil rights, peace, human rights, and even now a fourth party. There would be no major movements for humanization in this land today were it not for the church.

Yes, I am for special ministries and new forms of the church. We have got to have them and fund them with money that is now going down religious rat holes. But I am just as convinced from the cold, hard pragmatic point of view that these things are only possible as the plain old parish creates and supports them. And the key to it all is the training of parish clergy. Brothers and sisters, equip yourselves for what still may be the most exciting call God can place upon a man.

# The Relation of Religion to Government

GEORGE F. KENNAN

WHEN I first began to ask myself what I might suitably talk about this morning, I was under the strong impression of what seemed to me to be the evidences of extensive dissolution in the body politic in which I was born and reared, and I thought to pose the question: how does the Christian layman react to the failure and disintegration of a political system in which he has been taught, perhaps wrongly, to put a considerable portion of his faith and his hopes for a meaningful development of human society? How does he react to the evidences of failure on the international scene: the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the advancing spectre of massive over-population and famine throughout large parts of the world? How does he react to various phenomena here at home: to the alarming alienation and disaffection of great parts of our Negro population, to the continuing deterioration of our great cities as centers for residence and culture? To our failure to cope with the problem of rural poverty? How does he react to the progressive destruction or pollution of the natural resources and beauty of this country? And to the exploitation and abuse of the whole process of communication by the commercialization of the mass media and their exploitation by the advertiser? How does he react to the obvious disorientation and demoralization, in part even the decadence, of a considerable portion of our student youth? These with similar unsolved problems added up, it seemed to me, to something like the failure of our so-

ciety. But this was unexpected. Nothing in my upbringing had prepared me for it. And it hit hard. What was, then, the Christian response?

But the more I thought about this, the more I was compelled to ask a second question: whether the fact that one lived in a failing society made any difference? Whether the relationships between faith and politics were not the same, whether it was good times or bad times one lived in. I realized then, that I was back in the clutches of an age-old question and questions on which men have debated and disagreed for centuries—the question of the relation of religion to government. And it is on this question that I am going to be so bold as to offer a few thoughts this morning, putting them forward, I must say, with some diffidence and only for purposes of discussion, and asking your indulgence in advance for the evidences of ignorance and the philosophic crudities I know they will contain. What, then, if I may phrase the question this way, is the obligation of the Church and of the layman, with respect to the political scene in general, but particularly with relation to a trend of secular events which threatens to change our lives in no uncertain way—and not for the better?

## I

Let us consider, first, the layman. I see two aspects of his obligation with relation to political and governmental affairs, and they are very different one from the other.

(a)

The first is the obligation he has to bear his weight as a citizen in a secular body politic to which he professes allegiance and of which he accepts the protection and other benefits. There are various ways in which he can do this. He can participate as a public official. He can take part in private political activity. Or he can relate himself to it simply as a voter. But whatever form this obligation takes, it is not really a religious duty, and should not be confounded with one. It is a secular duty, arising out of the social compact that is implicit in any democratic society, any society where the individual is duly represented in the governmental process.

Now this sort of participation is a form of involvement in the authority of government—in the exercise by men of power over other men. But this is a process in which there is, from the Christian standpoint, always and inevitably an extensive element of corruption. The mere experience of participation in government, is an unsettling thing. It produces the characteristic giddiness of high position and authority. It arouses and stimulates a whole series of human qualities that have nothing to do with Christian purposes: ambition, vanity, self-love, greed, envy, competitiveness, the love of public attention, the appetite for flattery. These motivations enter at a thousand points into the final product of any political effort. However lofty the ideals of statesmen, the workings of government are for this reason always at best morally ambivalent, and should not be confused with effort to realize Christian ideals.

This does not mean that it is wrong for men to participate in government.

Government is a necessity of the human condition. It is a sad necessity, perhaps—the product of man's weakness, not of his strength (if he were what he should be, you wouldn't have to have it)—but it is a necessity nevertheless. Its absence—by which I mean that state of chaos and of unrestrained violence and willfulness that would ensue if it did not exist at all—would certainly represent a deterioration of the environment for the realization of Christian ideals. There is therefore nothing sinful for the Christian layman when he takes part in the governmental process. On the contrary: his activity can, depending on its quality, be useful to the Christian community.

But let him not deceive himself about the significance of what he is doing. He is involving himself deliberately in a process that cannot be other than corrupt. In every decision he makes in company with other men, he is perpetrating an act of moral ambiguity. He should enter on this activity only in a spirit of sadness and humility, remembering that its imperfections and its inevitable injustices are the shameful concomitant of human weaknesses in which he himself shares—something to be corrected, of course, wherever the opportunity presents itself, but never to be fully redeemed at the level of worldly political action. He should beware, above all, of any gratification of the ego he may derive from the exercise or the experience of governmental authority and he should beware of it especially when he has the illusion of doing good. I think, in this connection, of the marvelous words of a great Scottish pastor: "Am I going to do a good deed? Then, of all times, Father, into thy hands, lest the enemy should have me now."

## (b)

Now all this, as I say, is the way that the individual Christian should regard his efforts when he mingles them with those of other people in the political arena. But there is another capacity in which he influences the public life of his country—whether in the governmental office or in the political organization or even in his private activity—and this is his capacity as a human individual, relating to other individuals in the course of his daily duties and doings. Here he has an endless succession of choices—so many that for most of us our responses become largely matters of habit. He can be generous, honorable, truthful, considerate of other people's feelings and burdens, prepared to bear his share—or more than his share—of that load of social courtesy and cheerfulness and helpfulness that keeps the wheels of the world turning. Or he can be the opposite of all these things. His choice, here, is his alone; it is a responsibility before his conscience and his God; it is not polluted by association with that of other men for worldly purposes. Here there is, at least theoretically, the possibility of saintliness, of purity. And the question as to which of these things he is, is definitely a religious matter—religious in the deepest and most proper sense.

## II

Not only is it a religious matter for the individual but it is, for the same reason, a proper concern for the Church. For the Church, in fact, it is not only *a* concern, but a central concern, perhaps *the* concern. For what is at stake here is nothing other than the experience and development of the human soul; and it

was for the salvation of this individual soul—not for the salvation of institutions, not for the collective salvation of bodies of men gathered together for the purpose of ruling other men, not, then, for the salvation of bodies politic or governments—that Christ's sacrifice was made on the Cross. And it is to help men become aware of the meaning of this sacrifice, to realize the salvation it implies and be guided by that realization in their day-to-day lives, that the Church, as I see it, exists.

Precisely because the problems of secular life are today so excruciating and alarming, there is no lack of voices being raised to assert that it is the duty of the Church to involve itself directly on the secular scene: to relieve poverty, to influence foreign policy, to assure social justice, to enter the lists of public discussion on political problems, to lobby for idealistic solutions. People say the Church is in danger unless its activity becomes (to use that terribly abused and over-worked word) *relevant* to the political problems of the day. Is it presumptuous to question this view? Is there not a possibility that the greater danger for the Church is that it will be persuaded to forget its true function and to lose its true meaning and power by trying to participate in an arena of human affairs where it does not belong, where it can be only a poor competitor, where it has much to lose and little to gain.

The obligations of the Church as an institution must never be confused with those of the Christian layman. The layman, aware of his limitations, aware of the burden of original sin that has made government a necessity of his existence, can properly take upon himself the morally-ambiguous and humiliating respon-



sibility of participating in the political or governmental process. He has, as I have already noted, only himself to answer for.

The Church, on the other hand, is not an individual. It does not and cannot speak for itself alone. It has obligations of conscience, but these are the obligations of the agent, not the principal. The Church has a unique treasure to preserve: which is its privileged role as the teacher and organizer of others in the realization of Christian ideals. Its deepest duty, as I see it, is to guide and shape the Christian individual: to teach him to walk in God's ways, to extend to him the comfort of the sacraments, to support him in his moments of weakness, to console him in his failures, to teach him how to bear the heaviest of his sorrows, to maintain him in the strength of his belief. It is the task of the Church to help men seek forgiveness for those injustices and imperfections of government in which they are inevitably involved. The Church is there to give solace to those who return from the political scene, as men often do, battered and disheartened by what they have experienced there, to help them to put into the proper place, philosophically, the disappointments and frustrations to which, in the long run, no political career and no political activity is immune, to send them back again with new heart, new faith, new humility. The Church must not compromise itself in men's eyes by sharing in this political involvement; because to the extent it does so it must inevitably lose the purity of purpose that should be peculiarly its own; and it must forfeit, together with that purity of purpose, the confidence and reverence of its parishioners, without which it cannot do its work.

As I look at the Protestant congrega-

tions of this country and particularly the upper-class ones, it seems to me that the Church too often contents itself with the occasional appearance of the parishioner in church, with appeals for his financial support for what it views as worthy projects, and with the organization of a certain amount of social activity, designed to compete with the more lurid secular attractions of contemporary life. But would the Church not have a wider and more beneficial influence on the life of this country, I ask myself, if it would concentrate its efforts, with sternness, with gentle insistence and yet not without charity, on the shaping of the character and personal behavior of its individual lay members?

This is, I know, treacherous ground. It involves the dangers of trespass on privacy, of snooping and gossip, of an outward piety combined with an inner intolerance. It raises the spectres of all those evils and extremisms of narrow sanctimoniousness that were common to the Puritan communities of our own colonial period.

But a function cannot be abandoned just because it is vulnerable to misuse. The Christian layman of our age has a far greater need for stiffening in the face of the dilemmas of personal life than did any other Christian layman in history. The unprecedented number of choices open to him; the availability of a thousand refined comforts and indulgences; the attacks constantly being levied by the mass media against the clarity of his understanding; the never-ending insidious suggestions of the advertiser for the improvement of his personal comfort; the difficulties of rearing children in a wholly permissive and rapidly-changing environment; the fussy concealment of the reality of death; in

short, the whole great pernicious and debilitating discipline of contemporary American life sets up strains the successful countering of which is generally beyond the power of the individual acting in isolation—for this he needs the support of the Church and of his fellows in the Christian community. So subtle, so massive, so ubiquitous are the attacks to which the quality of his life is daily being subjected that they can be successfully resisted only by some form of counter-discipline. And this is a counter-discipline which has to be thought out and encouraged, if not imposed by bodies of men banded together for this purpose, fortifying each other in their resolve, combining their resources of ingenuity and moral strength in the creation and cultivation of a style of life that would not be a puritanical one, not narrow and intolerant, not devoid of humor and enjoyment, but a healthy one and an affirmative one, dedicated to the release and cultivation of man's constructive abilities rather than to their debauchment.

It is here, it seems to me, that the true possibilities of the contemporary American Protestant Church come into their own. The Church has it within its power to arm its parishioners far better than they are today armed to face these strains and to lead a healthy, simple and strong life in defiance of them. The Church can exert itself, with its love, its attention, its experience and its authority, to close the gap in ethical motivation and in personal discipline that has arisen by the disappearance of the harsh caprice of Nature as the principal challenging and disciplining force in men's lives and the sudden creation, in its place, of an environment of almost unnatural abundance and luxury. I know that our

Church already does these things to some extent, but it seems to me that the Catholic Church does them much better, and surely one could do more.

Nor need anyone be put off by the apparent modesty of this function. It is not really a modest one. There is no need for the Church to ask what becomes of its influence in the final confrontation of the layman with the political scene. There is no need to ask how true Christian feeling and strength find their ultimate translation into the realities of the secular world. They cannot fail to find it. The Church can rest assured that to the extent it can engender this sort of strength and discipline into the person of the individual layman it will have accomplished for the realization of Christian purposes far more than could have been accomplished by any amount of direct philanthropic or political activity.

### III

I began these remarks by speaking of some of the great unsolved problems of our contemporary society. I do not know what these problems add up to. Perhaps we shall muddle through, perhaps we shall not. Perhaps we are really on the decline as a political entity. This would be sad, but it would not be surprising. Two hundred years is no small span of time for national success. The record of history suggests that nations have at times been punished for a power and arrogance no greater than our own.

But it is not our obligation, as Christians, to pose these questions, or to answer them. They surpass our powers of foresight and judgment. Perhaps the United States in its present shape is agreeable in the sight of God. Perhaps it

is not. Perhaps it is part of his purpose that it should continue as the world's greatest and strongest and physically most successful nation; perhaps it is not. Why do we need to know?

What concerns us is that the community of people within this country who go by the name of Christian should learn to conduct themselves in a manner bearing some relation to that name, that they should learn to go forward as God-fearing people, firm in the principles of their faith, giving a Christian quality to their conduct, keeping themselves as far removed as possible from the pervasive corruption and self-indulgence of the time. If they do this within the framework of a successful and promising society, so much the better; but if it has to take place within the framework of an unsuccessful and declining one, so be it; nothing is then lost from the Christian standpoint. There is nothing in the gospels to say that the realization of Christian principles is dependent on the success of any particular political environment. It is a dreadful superficiality of religious thought, if not a sacrilege, to confuse the prospering of the United States as a political entity with

the fulfillment of God's purposes for the human race.

Actually, to end on a happier note, I personally doubt that we are that badly off. I think that this attention to the style and discipline of personal life is something we ought to give as a matter of religious duty and without regard to its ulterior effects; but I also think it very probable that if we were to give it as we should, the effects on the political scene would be tremendous and highly beneficial—and sufficient, in all probability, to turn the balance in the development of our society from failure to success. It was Alexis de Tocqueville who recognized, when he saw this country a hundred and forty years ago, that its true strength lay less in its institutions, with which he was unimpressed, than in the habits and behavior of the individual citizen. It is a common phenomenon that the highest human achievements come not when they are pursued directly, but rather as the incidental by-products of a dedication on the part of many people to some higher purpose—a dedication concerned outstandingly with the means of human endeavor, prepared to leave the ends to higher hands.

# The University as a Place of Revolution

ERNEST GORDON

As I was saying last Sunday, before I was interrupted so unkindly by the limitation of time, this University is good. It is a good place to be. Because it is good it can be better. The potential is within us. That potential has a great deal to do with us as "thinking needs." We exist, and we reflect upon the events of our experience. Reflection is essential if we are to be an authentic university, an authentic community. The reflection of which I spoke last Sunday is not the marijuana kind. The kind which is a trip *from* the world. It is, rather a trip *to* the world under the propulsion of trust and compassion. A trip *to* the world, of this nature, involves us in it. Involvement is a consequence, therefore, of reflective existence. At one time involvement meant rolling in existence in the same way that a dog rolls on a stinking fish or in a mess of putrification, and comes up smiling, and smelling.

The second point I want to make is that the university is a place of revolution; not in the political sense of overthrowing the establishment by force, but in the sociological and personal sense of a radical change made within society because of the dynamic forces at work within it. We would be in a pathetic condition if we were to ignore the revolutionary quality of the university's being.

Whatever we do, do not let us deceive ourselves into thinking that the real revolution is out there somewhere where we are not, and that it must be pursued according to certain fixed patterns of violence.

Revolution is in the soul of a university. It cannot be static. Neither can it be the mirror of the *status quo*. That would mean being a corpse or a prostitute. No, the university is dynamic. The source of its life is within and beyond itself. It has a quality of transcendence, a power which is of the spirit.

Cardinal Newman, as you may know, was installed as the first rector of the Catholic University of Ireland. He existed in that situation for seven years, and then gave it up because the powers of Irish Catholicism and Irish Nationalism were too much for one so finely and intellectually tuned. He reflected upon his experience and made it available to us in a book called, *The Idea of a University*. It is a wise reflection, as we would expect, for it grew out of suffering. He recalled how a revolution came to his beloved Oxford. It was a much needed one. The university had been sleeping for about 100 years. One day it woke up. "Good Lord," it said to itself. "We aren't what we should be. We exist for the younger members, but we're not teaching them, reaching them, or influencing them. We'd better begin to be a university." It did. Reforms were initiated which were so far-reaching that the world outside became violently angry. I'm glad to say that the more violent the protests became, the more the university realized that its revolution was "fitting and right." And once an Englishman decides that something is "fitting and right," that's it!

I like this picture of an old university becoming young again—so young, so



vital with the pulse of life that the cranky criticisms of the reactionaries contributed to the rejuvenating process. It dug its toes into the dust of life, and sang with reason for existence. Great, isn't it! The university stopped to think, and initiated a revolution.

#### A.

If you'll permit me to continue my reflection and to stretch my generalizations to their limits I'll go on to say that the university has the responsibility of initiating revolution, creatively, not destructively. I put my guns away some time ago. I can see no sense in using them again, for I hate violence. I feel it is important to realize that we are still participating in a revolution which originated within the university. This revolution is one of the big ones in the west, namely, the Renaissance and the Reformation. It originated as a revolution for war. It was led by university men who challenged the authoritarianism of a state type of Christendom, the wisdom of princes and bishops, and the unexamined premises of Aristotelian physics.

This big revolution is the one within which all the other little revolutions have their setting. We've been brought up on them as a staple diet, so much so that we have forgotten the context. To name but a few of the little ones: that of the Roundheads of England; that of the Puritans of New England as they broadened out into foetus of the U.S.A.; that of the French and German *bourgeoisie*; and that of the Russian Bolshevik. I am not sure that they were as good as we think they were. Something was missing in them. That something may be traced in the movement from university men like Erasmus and

Thomas Sucre to those like Karl Marx. He was a university man in the same tradition. Some thinkers say he ended it. Maybe he did.

He is the most revolutionary power of our time. Nowadays almost any kind of revolution is dedicated to him. People who know nothing of Hegel, and as much about the history of western thought, regard dialectic materialism as the guaranteed revolutionary panacea. Interesting, is it not, how the East has been so strangely influenced by a view so characteristically western? Is it a judgment on our civilization, and the Asiatics' experience of it, that their particular strand should have been snatched as the hope of redemption?

In the long run it is an inadequate hope. It does an about face and becomes a force against man.

I believe that the Christian humanism of the Renaissance and Reformation has been buried under a heap of theories, slogans, ideologies, and techniques similar to those of Marx.

Contrary to the contemporary mood I believe that it was the age of reason, and not the age of faith that threw up, like the tide, Adam Smith, the Industrial Revolution, and the glorification of wealth. It was a soulless logic that separated labor from working men to sell it as a commodity in the open market at the going rate.

That soulless logic damned men to the slavery of mines, mills, plantations, and the slums. The logic was brilliant, coldly and clearly so. Men who were irrational enough to speak out against it were shot down like dogs.

I think we have to thank Marx for seeing this slavery and seeking to abolish it. Those who were well and slept in luxury could not be expected to favor

him, but the workers of the world recognized that he had a point. The point remains. The hungry still need to be fed, the naked clothed, the sick nursed, the despairing encouraged, and the loveless loved.

### B.

The problem is that the Marxist revolution is not big enough, nor deep enough. The faith on which it is based is centered more upon the means than the end, more upon the concept of freedom from want than upon the personal freedom of men and women and children, and their unique personalities.

Bread, automobiles, split-levels, beer and TV cannot give man his true freedom. That is the problem of the truly secular city; the one that Dostoevsky saw so brilliantly when he composed the *Legend of the Grand Inquisitor*. I believe that the secular city may contribute a great deal to men. I can see that automation will provide more commodities, and save many people from the boredom of mass production and non-creative labor. But it cannot create freedom. Each revolution for the sake of economic control has resulted in a new brand of tyranny.

Perhaps we shall be compelled to relearn some of the old myths which tell us that there is no quick solution for existence. We may free ourselves from the controls of our natural environment, and create a variety of new and better ones. These, however, may be even more enslaving than that from which we have liberated ourselves. That is the story of man. Think of noble *Prometheus*! He broke out of his human environment to challenge the gods. For the good of mankind he stole fire from the heavens. His reward, you remember,

was grim. Zeus chained him naked to a pillar in the Caucasian mountains. Poor *Prometheus*, there in his defenselessness he is continuously attacked by a mean old vulture. His inwards are torn open. There on that mountain, summer and winter, this wise proto-man suffers the most intense agony. The vulture feeds on his ever-growing liver.

You know that mysterious pain you sometimes get in your inside? That's probably *Prometheus'* liver being worked over. I get that pain when I think of Chicago, and Biafra, and General LeMay's strategic nuclear weapons philosophy, and things like that. I suppose it is the pain of authentic existence.

The revolution for a better socioeconomic environment may be good, but not good enough. We are aware of this. It is their awareness that has caused some European thinkers to regard our era as the last days of the Renaissance: the fizzling out of a great revolution. The discovery of man as human and divine is lost in the deification of the state, the *status quo*, the system, the process, or the object. Last days, however, may also be first days: the first days of a new dark age, or a new age of enlightenment. In the greyness of our present penumbra we may perhaps regard the ferment of our western campuses and quadrangles as a rejection of the course the renaissance revolution has taken, and as a cry for help and personal guidance. It may be the last gasp of a body grown old with dissipation, excellent in appearance perhaps, but lacking in spirit. A beautiful body without spirit is still a corpse.

Those of you who have read Arthur Koestler's *Arrival and Departure* will remember how the hero of this novel is a revolutionary. As a consequence of

his activities against the Nazis he is captured and tortured. He manages to escape to a neutral country. There he is psycho-analyzed and instructed to forget his moral concerns. What really matters is happiness. Freedom is incompatible with it. On this basis he is booked to sail to that happy land far away, namely, these United States of America. At the last moment he chooses freedom and leaves the ship without baggage. His choice returns him to the agony, and to the revolution for man.

In a letter to the lovely mistress he has forsaken he tells her that he believes a new god is about to be born, one who will lead men into a dynamic and creative future.

The last we see of him he is dangling at the end of a parachute. He is involving himself in a new revolution, and we hope, a better one.

Perhaps that new revolution is beginning. Perhaps your student generation is its leaders. If it is under way then it is not because of a revolutionary or reactionary slogan we espouse. It is because there is some quality within us that is creative rather than destructive. We used to call this the grace of God, the grace of being human. It was this grace which kicked up its heels at Oxford in Newman's time.

With us it may be a similar type of revolution for men and their development as children of God.

### C.

The essential point is that the revolutionary power is not that of fear, or hate, or envy, but concern for others—even those with whom we disagree. I think we may expect that the university is a place where this kind of revolution for mankind as a people and not as an

abstraction, may be taught, learned, and acted upon.

It is not fixed *law and order* that we turn to, but God and each other. Jeremiah made that point clearly enough when he criticized the reforms of Josiah. These were good reforms in many ways, but like so many others they tried to establish a static *status quo*, an establishment to which men were expected to conform unquestioningly. What counts he told his fellow Israelites is justice between man and man, compassion for the weak, and reverence for life. Do the truth, do justly, have mercy, and walk humbly.

According to the New Testament God initiated a new phase in the revolution or evolution for men and their freedom in the event of Jesus, the Son of man for man. Like so many other rebels for God Jesus was executed. Before he was, however, he had prepared a dynamic nucleus to complete, or at least, continue his work. This was his little fellowships or followers. He consecrated them for the world, to be in the world, to be concerned for the world, and to love the world even as God loves it.

Thereby he created quite a problem for many of us. In a violent revolution we usually begin by hating those we are rebelling against. As you may know, it is rather hard to kick your favorite girl friend in the teeth for the sake of a political slogan, although it may be done sometimes. It is more efficient and less bothersome to hate. When we meet aggression with aggression, violence with violence, the only synthesis we have achieved is aggression and violence.

Sometimes moral men may initiate such revolutions. When they do they lose the morality and are left with more of the same against which they rebelled.

New demons more terrifying than the old appear from all kinds of hidden and dusty cupboards.

How, then, do we live at last with the establishment: for there is always one? There is not an easy answer. It is one, however, which the university may help work out. It is that of leading the way, setting the example, guiding the processes of law so that the establishment, which after all usually includes men and women, becomes more conscious of God's will for his people.

The great issues of human existence are not left or right, conservative or liberal, but right or wrong; for human freedom or against it; for the fulfilment of God's creation in peace or for its destruction through the stupidity of war.

The universities of the West have their last chance to confront the world, a world weary of war and slogans, a world scared to death, and live for it by

the truth which is life. They have their last chance to confront governments that are lost in the maze of their own lies, and moral cynicism. They have their last chance to confront the industrialists and to remind them that production for people takes precedence over profit.

The revolution for life is a spiritual one, engaged in by men, who have a passion for God and a compassion for people. The rewards are not obvious. But the revolution must go on. The life-giving power in the world is still the moral man. Universities have their last chance of being moral communities pledged to the moral regeneration of the world. If they fail or if they withdraw to the craven security of irrelevant abstractions, or to the support of political opportunism, then they may pull down the curtains of a new age of darkness.



# Fathers and Sons

SEWARD HILTNER

SINCE this is Parents' Weekend, and perhaps also because I am myself a Son of Lafayette, it occurred to me that this would be an auspicious occasion to consider the "generation gap" that seems so prominent today—especially to see if our modern attempts to understand Christian faith and make it relevant to our day have any contribution to make to this problem.

Partly by chance, since I was actually engaged on another project at the time, I found myself reading again, and in entirety, the two books of Samuel in the Old Testament. Suddenly, in my reading, a light dawned. As Ian Ramsey says, the "penny dropped," and I realized that these stories—from the birth of Samuel to the old age of David—were a series of case histories of the generation gap in ancient Israel.

As I read on through even the unpronounceable names, I found myself asking the question: Whose side is the author on? Is he for the young men, or for the fathers? Does he attribute the trouble to those who have become set in their ways and have become inattentive to how things have changed? Or is he on the side of the sons and pioneering and a new world of some kind?

The answer is quite clearly that the author does not take sides, in general, either for the fathers or the sons. He sides every time with those given approval by the Lord, and sometimes this means fathers and sometimes, sons. With some, approval is given on some occasions, when deserved, and withheld on others when evil has been done.

A.

Let me remind you of the essence of some of these stories, seen from a generation gap point of view.

The first son on the scene is Samuel himself, and he is the only one who remains a hero from beginning to end. His parents, Elkanah and Hannah, had been unable to have children; so his mother swore to Eli the priest that, if she had a son, he would be dedicated to the Lord. Accordingly, as soon as Samuel was old enough, he was sent to the theological seminary run by President Eli. Despite the arbitrariness of this procedure, Samuel made it, eventually succeeded Eli, and guided the nation on through the up and down period of King Saul's reign. No other father in the whole series of tales could be unmitigatedly proud of his son but Elkanah.

Even Eli, seminary president that he was, had trouble. His two sons are called "worthless men," and were killed by the Philistines in battle. At the time of the battle the wife of one son died in childbirth. So poor Eli lost everything so far as future generations were concerned, despite his being a good man.

And Samuel himself, good man that he remained, was not able to make it with his offspring. It is reported that they "did not walk after his ways," that "they took bribes and perverted justice." Whatever his skill in priesthood and statecraft, it was insufficient to let Samuel set the pattern in his own household.

When we come to Saul, the handsome

young first king of Israel, he gets off to a good start domestically through his son, Jonathan, who remains a good man throughout his life until his untimely death in the same battle in which his wounded father finally commits suicide. But Jonathan becomes a close friend of David, the shepherd boy turned hero, whom the Lord has selected to succeed the emotional and vacillating Saul. To make the story even more complex, David demonstrates two rare talents that lead Saul virtually to adopt him as a son. He uses his sling to kill the Philistine giant Goliath and thus saves the people. And as an artist on the ancient equivalent of the guitar, he plays mood music when Saul gets worked up, and brings the king back to normal. But the king cannot stand competition. He tries again and again to have David killed, but never succeeds. At this stage David is the son who deserves to make it, while Saul goes on downhill.

The climactic story is of course about David. Except for his hanky panky in sending off Bathsheba's husband to be killed in battle so he can have the lady, David is represented throughout as a good man. But he has abominable luck with his children.

His oldest son, Amnon, became enamored of his own half-sister, Tamar. By pretending he was ill, he got David himself to send Tamar to his bedroom, where Tamar was forced into an incestuous relationship. This event so angered another son, Absalom, that he had Amnon killed, and drove the rest of the brothers away from home, so that they are never heard from again.

The charming and popular Absalom, beginning to find himself a favorite with the people, decided to go into politics in a big way; and for a time it

seemed that he would unseat his father from the throne. Poor David was in a dilemma. He was compelled, through social responsibility, to have his armies defeat those of Absalom. But he did his best to save Absalom's life. Finally as he was riding, Absalom's hair caught in a tree and he was slain. The moving passage that was read shows David's deep grief over Absalom's death. Nor was he to know, in his senile years, that another son, Solomon, would turn out fairly well.

I am very far from believing that these ancient, and often brutal and violent, stories can be transliterated into a suitable moral for our own day. What I do believe to be translatable is the ambiguity. Is there anything the best father can do to guarantee that his sons will come out as he hopes? Is there anything the best son can do to prevent his father from sliding downhill? From the books of Samuel, the answer seems no to both questions. True, there may be an occasional exception, such as the adopted sonship of Samuel by Eli the priest. But perhaps even Samuel, if he had stayed home with his own father, might not have made it.

There is another possible implication of these Old Testament stories for the generation gap problem today. All the fathers and sons in the story either were, or became, the beneficiaries of affluence. Kingly and priestly wealth did not invariably corrupt, but it seems to have helped. Taking too much for granted, on the part of either fathers or sons, seems in itself to have produced a wider generation gap.

## B.

At this point I asked myself whether the New Testament had anything to say

about the generation gap that went beyond the ambiguities of the Old. And of course the story of the Prodigal Son came first to mind.

Here the younger son worms the trust fund out of his father, goes off to metropolis, soon loses both his money and his friends; and finally in humble desperation, decides that he has nowhere else to go but home. While he is yet a long way off, his father sees him, welcomes him without reservation, and provides a feast to demonstrate his being accepted without conditions. When the older son protests that he has not been given equal time, the father chides him for his selfish moralism.

On the face of the story, here would appear to be a new kind of solution to the generation gap. The principal responsibility is put in father's hands. Father should forgive and accept no matter what. But there is actually one condition, namely, the son must repent. Where these two conditions are present, then the story seems to imply that the gap can be closed.

The trouble with all this is, however, that the story is not actually about a human father at all but about God. God, Jesus is saying, is like this kind of father. All we need to do is as the prodigal did, repent and come home. The story is not a moralistic exhortation to fathers to be like this symbolic father. No human father is or can be so good as that.

The message of this story to the generation gap problem seems to me to lie at another point, in the attitude of the two sons. Symbolically, all of us including actual fathers are sons for purposes of this story. The message is repent, do not hold grudges, think of something beyond your rights. Or, to

put this in more modern language, what have you done to try to see the world from the other fellow's point of view? Whether you are an actual father or son? Can one who is well shaved look, as the psychologists say, "phenomenologically" at the interior point of view of him who has a beard? Can neatness, before condemning, look on apparent disorder with some glimmer of understanding—and *vice versa*? To become understanding of the other point of view is not the same thing as being converted to it. The gap is not removed, but it may be prevented from becoming a chasm.

### C.

I am sure that the causes for the kind of generation gap we have today are multiple. And I find myself partly reassured that our present gap, however serious, is not so bad as it has been in some previous ages. Perhaps our partially democratized family life, our increase in educational opportunities, and other achievements of civilization, are in some measure preventing our gap from becoming cataclysmic.

But our situation is serious, and I see one basic fact about the relation of fathers and sons today that is different both in kind and degree from that of past ages. If we look at this from the point of view of fathers, it is their having a much more generalized, but often much more rigid, ambition in relation to their sons. It is a rare father today who can insist, or succeed, in having his son necessarily follow his own occupation. Besides, this is bad form. But even if this father never says it in words, he is very likely to convey to his son, "It doesn't matter what you do so long as it is respectable and so long as you are

successful at it." If a son had only to deal with a father who told him to join his own occupation, he could conform or rebel. In response to the more generalized ambition of his father today, he can hardly know whether he is conforming or rebelling. The pressure is more diffuse. The responses are, therefore, more complex and confusing.

If we switch over and look at this modern difference from the point of view of the son, then we see sons as believing they have to go along with an entire "establishment," or maintain some appropriate distance from it. Thus, I believe the more generalized ambition on the part of fathers tends to generate a more depersonalized form of rebellion on the part of sons; and this sense of depersonalization on both sides seems to widen the generation gap.

#### D.

According to the perceptive psychoanalyst, Erik Erikson, the primary life task of late adolescence is to find one's real "identity." This task involves moving emotionally out of the earlier dependence upon the primary family, making one's way into the eventual world of work and energy, and coming to terms with the need for intimate relationship with primarily the opposite sex. A certain degree of cutting off of the old kind of relationship to father is essential to fulfilling these tasks.

If father had really achieved an appropriate sense of identity, that was not dependent entirely upon the culture and persons around him, then presumably he could watch this process in his son—with all its fits and starts and trial balloons—and really distinguish the experimental from the alarming.

If, on the other hand, father has al-

lowed himself to become the victim of an "other-directed" society, to use the phrase of David Riesman, and is not really sure who he is, then he may most misunderstand the authentic efforts of his son to find genuine identity.

To my own regret, I am afraid I believe that it is just this phenomenon that is widespread today. In saying so, I am not spanking fathers and exonerating sons. Many sons are too blind and indiscriminate in the ways in which they are seeking identity, even if the object of their quest is a good one. But the fact is that they are not helped to use more discriminating means if they have fathers who know little about who they are except by giving their title, income, and similar marks of external respectability. Perhaps a little repentance on both sides—in the New Testament sense of taking a new look at the internal position of the other—would help.

Properly enough, our society today has a special concern for those sons who have apparently "turned off" entirely from what to them seems to be an impossibly square world. Whether they turn to the opium drugs or LSD, to sexual promiscuity and casualness, to economic irresponsibility, or to other apparent hatches of escape, a democratic society must be disturbed when there is massive rebellion against even the defensible aspects of the Establishment. I have no solution to this dimension of the problem. Some of these unhappy young people may very well, unlike the prodigal son, remain in the metropolitan pig-pen for the rest of their lives. But even when their plight has been complicated through unjust discrimination by reason of race, color, or national origin, we believe rightly that many will



return. When they do, are society and the church ready to receive them? Along with the sharp critical criteria they have learned as a result of the pig-pen? I hope so. Certainly none of us can disclaim some complicity in the problem.

E.

In a congregation like this, we have few instances of extreme rebellion. The fact that both fathers and sons are here means that the sons are at least agreeing to be subjected to higher education, and that is the most important conformity of all today from the paternal point of view. This is indeed the best way to follow the injunction to do what you want but to make sure you have a chance of success at it.

I see two dangers here. One is that the generation gap, with allowances and all, may go underground, and father-son communication will become either superficial or hypocritical. The other is that the sons may become premature conformists, using the success standards of their fathers to stunt their own movement toward self-identity. So a little bit of generation gap, I think, is a good thing.

F.

Does our Christian faith really have anything to say to the generation gap problem? I believe it does, and that I have identified some parts of that message. It surely has no automatic answer. Let me recapitulate briefly what that contribution seems to be:

1. Without some gap between the generations, civilization would be endlessly repetitive. A gap is dangerous only when it becomes a chasm.

2. From either side of the generation gap, the procedural remedy is trying to see the internal point of view of the other with no compulsion to adopt it, but only to understand it sympathetically.

3. If adult society can become a bit less perfectionistic or rigid in its ambitions for the rising generation, it can help the necessary rebellions of sons to be less harmful to themselves and others.

4. If the society of sons can see that it is its own job to find "identity," and not merely to put fathers in their place, then it may even help fathers to do the unfinished work on their own self-identity.

5. There will always be ambiguity, but new starts are never impossible.

# The Little Word "Amen"

JACK M. MAXWELL

Publication of the following sermon has had to wait two years at least in order for some measure of its effectiveness to be taken. Now it can be claimed with some conviction that Charles W. Baird's simple hope for all Presbyterian worship has, after 114 years, come true in at least one congregation: "We look for the time when our congregations shall take part in the public prayers of the Church, by an audible *Amen* at the close of each prayer; and by the recital of the Lord's Prayer and the Creed after the minister."<sup>1</sup> This sermon and this introductory word are offered now in the hope that they may provide a clue for someone else who would like to re-introduce this historic practice into the worship of his own congregation, but who is also perfectly convinced that if it were temporarily begun by a few timid souls, it could never be sustained over the long haul.

The congregation, in which this writer served as an assistant minister, is composed of approximately 700 members and located in a Philadelphia suburb. For two years steady progress had been made in matters liturgical. One entire Lenten series was devoted to the subject; under the direction of the senior minister the Session spent several months studying the *Directory for Worship*; and all the senior high school students had a required course in the history and character of Christian worship. Slight but significant changes were gradually made in the Lord's Day service, such that it closely resembled the classic ante-communion order of Bucer and Calvin. The number of communions was increased at least to the point that the congregation became aware that the Eucharist was the norm of all worship, even if it were not celebrated weekly. And, of equal importance, the ministers conducted worship with a sense of dignity and high purpose which was, in time, noticeably communicated to the congregation.

In spite of the ready acceptance of these several changes, it nevertheless surprised the ministers when the Session first raised the question of the congregational Amen. Someone asked: "If the *Directory for Worship* calls for it (Chapter IV, Paragraph 3), then should our congregation not be saying it?" The ministers readily agreed in principle; however, both of us knew of congregations whose bulletins called for the Amen, but not a sound was uttered by the people. That situation we did not want.

Since this writer was engaged in doctoral studies in liturgics at the time, the senior minister assigned him the task of explaining the Session's request. Explaining proved to be the lesser difficulty; convincing was by far the greater problem. He could reasonably assume by this time that the congregation would give him a considered hearing; but he had every reason to suspect that the first time or two would prove sufficiently upsetting and half-hearted that the matter would end almost before it had begun. For this reason he decided to risk a trial run as a part of the sermon itself, making the response as much a game—albeit a serious one—as possible. In retrospect several members of the congregation told him, more than two years later, that this technique won the day. Otherwise, as will be evident, this sermon is basically a word study, using Deuteronomy 27 (selected) and 1 Corinthians 14:1-19 as the scripture readings, and C. H. Bateman's "Come, Christians Join to Sing" (which reinforces the point even further) as the concluding hymn.

Today the congregation not only responds with a *hearty* Amen at the appropriate places in the service of worship, but also when visiting members in homes and hospitals it is found that even in these circumstances their audible Amen makes what was once only the minister's table thanksgiving or prayer for comfort and healing their prayer, too. And that, after all, is the purpose of the little word "Amen."

---

<sup>1</sup> *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies: Historical Sketches* (New York: M. W. Dodd, Publisher, 1855), p. 260.

A POPULAR song some time ago, and one still heard occasionally, is "Little Things Mean a Lot." This is certainly true of one little word in particular, often thoughtlessly used, namely, the little word "Amen."

Customarily I counsel students not to preach on a single word—especially one like "If" or "But" or "Nevertheless," even though some of the pulpit masters have done so with notable success. Such a sermon, however, tends to be tricky and cute and, worst of all, unbiblical. But if there is a single word which gives us an insight into the self-understanding of the Biblical and historical Church, it is the little word, "Amen." Beyond even that, it tells us much about a correct understanding of the contemporary Church, and especially of the Church at worship.

As you know, the order of worship followed by a Presbyterian congregation is the constitutional responsibility of the Session. Recently your Session voted to urge the congregation to respond to the several parts of the service with an audible, corporate "Amen." It is now my task to explain some of the historical and theological reasons which support such a decision. Let me assure you that my assignment is a serious one, but one which will not be quite as laborious as it may sound.

## I

"What is the meaning of the little word 'Amen'?" That is the final question in the Heidelberg Catechism—a sixteenth-century document now a part of the Constitution of our denomination. The Catechism provides this answer:

Amen means: this shall truly and cer-

tainly be. For my prayer is much more certainly heard by God than I am persuaded in my heart that I desire such things from him.

In short: "Amen" is a Hebrew word which means "So be it" or "Let it be so," and an examination of its usage in the Bible is helpful in understanding its importance for public worship. The most familiar and pointed occurrence in the Old Testament is the selection read to you from Deuteronomy. Here the minister or priest read the law to the people: "Cursed be he who dishonors his father or his mother." And with one voice the people responded, "Amen, let it be so." In this act the people identify with the law; they make it their own by saying, "Amen."

Another occurrence of the word is in I Chronicles 16:36, where the final verse of a long poem of thanksgiving reads like this:

Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel,  
from everlasting to everlasting.  
Then all the people said "Amen!" and  
praised the Lord. (RSV)

In this instance we see that the little word "Amen" becomes a word of praise and thanksgiving. When the people identify with the law or the prayer, they praise God. God is praised when his words become the very life of his people; and his people acknowledge this by saying "Amen."

A very interesting function of "Amen" appears in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. Several of the people there were speaking in unknown tongues during the service of worship; and they argued that theirs was the highest of all spiritual gifts. Paul's reply is precise and to the point: corporate

worship, its prayers and hymns, must be intelligible to all. Tongues are fine in your private devotional life; but the prayers and hymns used in worship must be both inspired and understandable. Then comes this verse:

Suppose you are praising God in the language of inspiration [in unknown tongues]: how will the plain man who is present be able to say 'Amen' to your thanksgiving, when he does not know what you are saying? (I Corinthians 14:16, NEB)

This tells us both about the prayers themselves and about the function of "Amen." In the Bible the whole of worship is a corporate act of the people of God. There are no spectators; rather all of us are the actors, each with a different role to play. And the prayers, as certainly as the hymns, are the people's prayers. The leader in worship offers these prayers on behalf of the congregation; not necessarily because he can do it better, but because that is his role. The prayers must be inspirational and intelligible and directed to God, not to the congregation—those are the requirements to be fulfilled by the leader. But the congregation also has a responsibility, for the prayers are theirs, not the leader's alone; therefore at the very minimum the congregation must stay awake and alert, ready at the appropriate time to pronounce its "Amen"—let it be so.

Paul makes another reference to "Amen" in his second letter to the same Corinthian congregation. Listen to this interesting statement:

Jesus Christ is the 'Yes' pronounced upon God's promises, every one of them. That is why, when we give

glory to God, it is through Christ Jesus that we say 'Amen.' (II Corinthians 1:20, NEB)

If you want proof of God's promises—his faithfulness and his love—you have it in Jesus Christ, God's 'Yes' to us. When we say "Amen"—"Let it be so," we say it through Jesus Christ, because he is the "It" in "Let it be so." When we say "Amen," then, we are affirming our acceptance of Jesus Christ. Understood that way, "Amen" is the most appropriate word in worship and must be voiced by the whole people, for we are the Body of Christ.

There is one last Biblical reference. The first words of the Bible are "in the beginning." Could you guess what the very last word is? Would you believe "Amen?"

He who testifies to these things says, "Surely I am coming soon." Amen. Come, Lord Jesus. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with all the saints. Amen. (Revelation 22:21, RSV)

Through the little word "Amen" we affirm a manger, a cross, and an empty tomb—the incarnation in history of all God's promises to us, his people. And through the same little word "Amen" we become an expectant people, awaiting the return of Jesus Christ, the Second Coming of him who is the Lord of history.

## II

Now that is how "Amen" reflects the corporate nature of Biblical worship. What has happened to our little word in the years since the New Testament? Well, hang onto your seats, because you are about to get a fast cook's tour of nineteen centuries.



During the first four centuries worship was still understood as the corporate response of the people of God to the gift of God in Jesus Christ. Communion was celebrated weekly and it was understood as an act in which the people received the gift of God's living presence, union with Christ, and the forgiveness of sins. In response the people offered themselves to God—their labors and their lives.

From the fourth century to the sixth the idea of worship changed as the concept of sacrifice began to play an increasingly important role. Instead of offering themselves, the people now offered Christ back to God—a thoroughly unbiblical idea indeed. Once that notion became popular, the theologians were then faced with a serious problem: how can Christ be offered if he is in heaven? Soon the answer was found. It is a \$10.00 word, but it is also a \$10.00 idea: transubstantiation, or the literal and physical transformation of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ. How could that happen? Very simply. The Church said it happened when the priest repeated the Words of Institution.

In a stroke the corporate nature of worship was gone; and it remains gone to this day in Roman Catholicism. The people have no significant role to play in what is still a completely priest-centered worship. While the reforms of the recent Vatican Council permit the people greater participation in worship, the changes make no substantial difference, because the "miracle of the Mass" is still transubstantiation—an event which requires a priest and the Words of Institution.

The Reformation sought to change all that. Worship became corporate again. Hymns were written in the ver-

nacular language; preaching was returned to its rightful place; and an attempt was made to restore the weekly communion. Once more the "Amen" sounded in the worship of God, for the people were a people again; and this was their act.

So it was for the next one hundred years, until the Puritans, the Presbyterian descendants of Calvin, came under the influence of the Separatists. Calvin insisted that the Church is the elect people of God, and that the true Church is found where the Word is rightfully proclaimed and the sacraments are duly administered. The Separatists, on the other hand, argued that the Church is a voluntary society of the converted. Now, look at the difference. Calvin understood the Church to be a corporate people—an organism which is more than and greater than the sum-total of its individual parts. The Separatists' picture of the Church was of a group of individuals, each his own authority, who just happened to be at the same place, doing roughly the same thing at approximately the same time. So thoroughly did they reject anything corporate, that hymns were no longer sung and even the Lord's Prayer was not permitted. The extreme of this view is, of course, the Society of Friends.

In later centuries revivalism added still another perversion through its solitary emphasis on individual conversion. As a result, Presbyterian worship became the exclusive property of the clergy and choir. They were responsible for the creation of an emotional crisis which would guarantee the familiar "decision for Christ." The congregation's role was restricted to a few hymns—hymns such as this one:

When I was but a little child, how  
 well I recollect  
 How I would grieve my mother with  
 my folly and neglect;  
 And now that she has gone to heav'n,  
 I miss her tender care.  
 O Savior, tell my mother I'll be there!

According to Howard G. Hageman, an expert on Reformed worship, this was also the time when

The organ was taken out of the rear gallery where it had been ever since it was allowed in a Reformed church, its golden pipes strewn across the front of the church, with seats for a choir placed between the organ pipes and the pulpit platform.<sup>1</sup>

In a word, worship was no longer the corporate offering of the people of God, as it had been in the first century and in the sixteenth. The "Amen" was heard, but not as one voice; rather as individual mutterings punctuating the emotional displays of clergy and choir. Sermons were as long as you probably think this one is going to be: two hours; and the famous "pastoral prayer," composed on the spur of the moment, had to consume sixty minutes and as many "Amens," else the congregation sought a new minister.

This was the worship of our church until late in the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, when the so-called liturgical revival and the ecumenical movement together made every Protestant denomination re-examine its worship in light of Biblical principles and historical development. Throughout the congregations of the Presbyterian Church the corporate "Amen" is again

beginning to be heard. Priestly worship—or that conducted by clergy and choir alone—is simply not Biblical worship; nor is it Presbyterian worship, if we are true to the Reformation.

But will all the evils of our past be corrected when this congregation says "Amen"? No, of course not; but it is a start toward that correction. And can the "Amen" not become merely a meaningless form? Yes, of course it can; but it does not have to be, and if it were to become meaningless and routine, it would always be there to remind us of what our worship ought to be. For these reasons, then, the session makes its request: for a people's worship through Jesus Christ our Lord.

### III

Specifically speaking, what are you asked to do, and when, and where? Following each of the prayers of Confession, Thanksgiving, Supplication, Intercession, and Dedication, you are to respond with the "Amen" as one voice. The prayer of Confession is printed, so you are safe there. Each of the other prayers will be concluded with the formula Paul suggested: "Through Jesus Christ our Lord." That will be your cue.

Following the prayer of Adoration your cue will be the minister's "Amen." The reason for this is simple: we use the prayers of Adoration in the Book of Common Worship, and they do not always conclude with the phrase "through Jesus Christ our Lord." For the same reason, the minister's "Amen" is also your cue following the Declaration of Pardon, the Ascription after the Sermon, and the Benediction. When you hear our "Amen," you respond with your "Amen." The choir will no longer sing the "Amen" after the Benediction. I

<sup>1</sup> *Pulpit and Table*, John Knox Press, (Richmond, 1962), p. 99.

grant you, it is pretty; but it is also priestly.

The first time I preached during a revival in my home town some elderly gentleman boomed out an "Amen" midway through my sermon, and the shock ruined my whole day. To prevent the sound of your corporate voice from frightening both you and me, I suggest we have a trial run. So worthy is our objective that I hope both God and our visitors will forgive this temporary suspension of decorum. Hopefully it will also convince the shy ones that the chances are slim of getting caught with a solo.

Now, here is your cue for all the prayers except Adoration. When you hear it, say the "Amen." "THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD." (It is a minor thing, but when Amen is sung, the proper pronunciation is *āmen*; when said the pronunciation is *āmen*. Let us try it once more: "THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD.")

This may appear mechanical and staged at first, but it will soon become a part of us. Let us try it one last time, making it a bit more difficult. Following the Adoration, Assurance, Ascription, and Benediction your cue is the minister's "Amen." Let me give you the

Benediction for today, and after I say "Amen," you make your response.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen.

The saga of the little word "Amen" begins in ancient Israel as many years before Jesus Christ as we live after him. Where the word appears in the worship of the Church, one finds a people—not perfect, but a people persuaded that they are the people of God; that the worship of God is their act, together. Where the corporate voice is missing, there one often finds a time of divisiveness and individualism—a time when worship is anything but the corporate offering of praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God.

The session of this congregation hopes that the saga will end here, in your corporate, audible voice. But it never really ends, because the little word "Amen" is a word of beginning, not of ending; for when it is uttered in belief and hope, it opens your life to Jesus Christ, the incarnate "Yes" pronounced upon every promise of God. That is why the Bible concludes: Amen. Come, Lord Jesus.

# Mature Priests

DIOGENES ALLEN

*Hebrews 5:1-14*

THE writer of Hebrews began the passage just read by talking of the office of High Priest in the Old Testament; and then of a new kind of priesthood, of a new kind of mediation between God and man wrought by Jesus. But then he abruptly turned aside from explaining the new order of priests because the hearer is unable to understand. The hearer is like a child, able to receive only milk. The mature would be able to understand, the mature who are able to distinguish good from evil.

This is an unusual statement of the nature of maturity. The mature, he says, are those who by practice have the faculties to distinguish good from evil. The mature are not those who have solved their identity crisis; who are extraverts; who can relate; who wax mightily about deeds to be done. For indeed by many criteria they are mature, but they do not have the maturity to be priests or to understand the priesthood. They do not have what it takes to understand the role of mediation, the work of God in Jesus.

But is it so hard to tell good from evil? Is it so hard that one needs to train one's faculties to do it? Surely not. Don't we know what is good? Isn't our trouble getting the motivation to do good, to seek it, to arouse others to act?

This passage seems to say No: it is hard to tell good from evil. Its writer is not infected with ethical relativism, with the academic sophistication that sanguinely decries our ability to justify any

judgment of value. For his claim stands as much against the relativism of the cosmopolitan, as it does against the absolutism of provincial common sense or the absolutism of the revolutionary. It is hard to distinguish good from evil because there is present a kingdom, a kingdom in the world but not of this world. Those who know nothing of this kingdom cannot distinguish good from evil, whatever their ethical theory may be.

This passage in Hebrews stands foursquare with all the New Testament in testimony to the Kingdom of God that has come in Jesus and that is to come. In fact it testifies that there are two kingdoms. A kingdom of this world is one of them: a kingdom that is not united in its views, its goals, its estimates of man's nature and destiny; not united in its plans for society, nor in its estimates of the value of religion. But it is a kingdom, a single kingdom, a kingdom of this world, a kingdom whose estimates are based only on what this world can deliver. It does not matter whether the estimates are pessimistic or utopian; they are estimates which investigation of the world and only the world are supposed to underwrite. None of them, even if they speak of gods or God, are based on another kingdom, a kingdom that is present with the coming of Christ.

The kingdom of Christ is not a placid one that exists in peace alongside any bedfellow. It comes, do we not know,



like a two-edged sword, cutting, hurting, and destroying. Jesus said, "I came not to bring peace, but a sword." "I came to kindle a flame." He comes to start a war, a war against our desire to be something, a war against any shiny coin, whether made of base metal or made of gold, which possesses us. He comes to cause a conflict with all the powers of the earth. He does not do this because he has a strategy of confrontation; for he is meek and lowly of heart. He tells us, "Blessed is he who finds in me no cause for offense." Yet God who comes to us and for us cannot avoid conflict because we are bound by another kingdom, whatever its name may be, however diverse its manifestations.

The writer of Hebrews then makes sense when he writes, "The mature are those who have their faculties trained by practice to distinguish good from evil." They have been engaged in struggling free of the ensnaring net of alien powers, within and without. They have by long experience seen again and again how easily they have been deceived and led astray. They have pointed their fingers at something and called it evil, and been fooled. They have raised their banners over something else and proclaimed it good, and it turned out not to be so. They have learned why the Devil is described as crafty, sly, and a deceiver. He does not put before us a false path, clearly labeled for all to see. He covers the landscape with paths, all of which are decked out with plausibility.

Good and evil, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of this earth are interlocked, mixed, wrapped together in conflict. They are like swirling coils of smoke in a great conflagration. The mature one knows this; for he has by

practice detected the conflict of two kingdoms within himself, he has been fooled more than once as to what is good and what is evil, and he has learned to distinguish some of the strands of the two kingdoms.

The one, who has not by practice trained himself to distinguish good from evil, is immature. He cannot understand the priesthood of Jesus; for him, it is irrelevant. He is led astray by slogans and the crowd, unable to sift their claims and causes. He is blown about by every wind of doctrine.

He cannot be a priest himself—of the new order of priests—one who can lead because he can distinguish what is of this world and what is of God. And though he gives away all that he has, and though he gives his body to be burned, he is not of the new order of priests.

Today we are too much like children. We do not know what our fathers knew: that evil always seeks to clothe itself in truth and righteousness, that whatever comes before us has to be sifted and some of it put aside, that there is always renunciation in the Christian life—all that comes cannot be kept. We are like children before a conjurer, easily taken in. Have we not been taken in? Have we not been taken in by the folly that tells us that there is no role for the clergy today? And we have done this with true sayings, such as: Go where the action is; the Church is a captive of its culture; there are many ministries. Indeed, go where the action is. The Church *is* overwhelmed by its culture. There *are* many ministries. But do we not see that the office of the ministry is a ministry too? Do we not see that the greatest weakness of the Church today is not its people, but its clergy?

Its people do not know God; its clergy do not know how to seek him.

What folly is this that castigates and wishes to leave to its own devices a Church of millions of souls as no fit pasture in which to labor, which at the same time, praises the Good Samaritan for binding up a broken man? Are we to be like the Levite—the old order of

priests—who passes by; or, are we to be of the new order of priests, who seek to minister to the broken body of Christ, his Church?

Are we not children, who cannot distinguish good from evil, and therefore cannot understand the priesthood of Jesus, the mediation he wrought, nor be of the new order of priests ourselves?

# Dialectics of Discipleship

IAN F. McINTOSH

*John 21:13-22*

Zen, or the SDS—which is your bag?

I SUSPECT that by temperament and inclination, most of us lean in one direction or the other. Either we are in danger of foundering on the barren rock of incessant introspection or unending research. Or we get sucked into the vortex of the clamoring demands of the moment. Either we get wrapped up in the introspective quest for self-understanding or in pondering over fascinating academic questions. Or we are activists who put up with this place like a hair shirt that has to be endured to acquire the necessary credentials so that we can “be about our father’s business.”

Yet one of the dialectics involved in the process of discipleship is that an “all or none” solution to this matter of reflection is inadequate. We have to hold the active mission and the reflective thought in balance—and not settle for a premature resolution of the tension by espousing one pole or the other.

Overt calls to discipleship are focussed at a few well-specified turning points in our lives: profession of faith; the decision to enter seminary; and perhaps in wrestling with the decision of whether to accept a call to a new field of service or to remain where one is.

But though, formally, the renewed call is in question occasionally, it is implicit daily, in the process of discipleship. Nor can it be lightly set aside as “settled”—because one happens to be a junior with a couple of years to go, or

because one “has tenure” as a professor, or because one is a wife and mother, or a pastor.

God forbid that I should advocate the perpetual agonizing reappraisals that serve to avoid ever actually having to *do* something. But there *is* value in a periodic review of where one is—perhaps on a somewhat more frequent basis than is occasioned by these great turning points in life.

It is to a crossroads in the life of Peter that we shall turn for some guidelines, for it serves to illuminate some of the other dialectics of discipleship that need reflecting on—the inextricable relation of the past, present, and future to each other, and the inner tensions of each of these.

## *1. Past obedience . . . and past failure*

Because the past can and should inform the present, let us think first of the *background* of discipleship, both Peter’s and our own—a background which in every case is a mixture of obedience and failure.

Jesus said to Peter, very simply, “You follow me.” But the apparent simplicity is deceptive. Try and put yourselves in Peter’s sandals, and imagine what *his* thoughts must have been on hearing those words. You remember the first time he heard them, as a very ordinary fisherman, working on the nets with his brother Andrew. And for some reason, Peter had been gripped, and had

begun to follow. That was three years before. *Now*, three years later, he hears the very same words, again by the lake-side, but this time from a Master who has risen from the dead: "You must follow me."

There had been joyful service in those years. But the time when he had been too proud to let Jesus wash his feet must also have crossed his mind. Then, too, there had been that wonderful occasion at Caesarea Philippi when in a flash of God-given inspiration he had realized that Jesus was the Christ! The Master had been deeply moved by that—until Peter spoiled it all by arguing against going forward to Jerusalem and the Cross.

The Cross! *That* thought could scarcely have left Peter for the rest of his days. He, the big fisherman, had been told by Jesus that he was the rock on which the whole church would be founded. And Peter had boasted that even if all the rest of the group let Jesus down, *he* would go even so far as to die for him. Yet later that same evening he had left his Master in the lurch in order to save his own skin, just as the rest had already done. As he looked back, Peter must surely have realized what a *mixture* of obedience and failure there had been!

Only God knows what the record of our past discipleship is like—how honest our questionings and doubts have been, how faithful and imaginative we have been in the church, how far we have been sensitive to the needs of others—and really put ourselves out to meet them. God only knows—and that is just as well.

But I would be prepared to bet, metaphorically speaking of course, that our records show the same mixed pattern of

both obedience and failure. And we need to pay appropriate attention to this past—neither getting a fixation there, *nor* brushing it aside as over and done with. We should have a clearer idea by now of our own blind-spots and inadequacies—of the particular ways in which we have failed our Lord in the past—and are likely to do so again if we just shrug them off. Without serious review of *the past*, any renewed promises in the present for the future are likely to be as treacherous as the Munich agreement, which was not worth the paper it was written on.

## II. *At this moment, justified . . . and, at this moment sinners*

Justified, accepted! For despite Peter's background, here was his Lord calling him once again to follow. So, too, we are called. And this is the astounding thing—here is the most convincing demonstration of forgiveness. *None* of Peter's past failure—failure to understand, failure to care, failure even to be loyal—none of this disqualified him from following the Master. And none of our own past inadequacy and failure disqualifies us!

Jesus, who knew Peter's past in detail, even as ours is known, was urging him to get back and on with the job. The risen Christ was facing him afresh with the same challenge. So there is no excuse for getting so bogged down in our failures and a welter of self-recriminations and guilt, that we are paralyzed as far as useful service is concerned. Yes, we are sinners—but there is no "out" here, for we are also justified.

Sinners, too, though! For at the same time, the *Lord* did ask Peter *three times*: "Do you love me?" Peter became increasingly indignant as he was asked



again and again. (He seems to have been in the activist camp!) But Jesus was forcing him to examine carefully whether he really did love him more than anything else. Peter is forgiven, but he is not let off the hook without some serious reflection, as if it was of no consequence for the present and future.

It is in doubt, you see. It is in *grave* doubt whether any of *us here* cares as much as we protest in words that we do. So this searching questioning is called for—not with the intent of rubbing our noses in our mistakes, but as an implicit warning against minimizing or glossing over the ambivalence and half-heartedness revealed by our past discipleship.

Nevertheless, we too *are* faced by a renewed call. We cannot use our unworthiness, and our shame and despair, as an excuse for not responding. But equally we have to guard against the presumptuous arrogance of assuming that everything we are about is inspired and faithful service.

We are at the same time justified and sinner—and this dialectic, too, has to be carefully held in balance against the temptation of polarization.

### *III. Future intentions . . . and future performance*

Insofar as Peter was going to continue to follow, the future task was unchanged and unavoidable: "Feed my sheep." Insofar as *we* truly follow, we both must and will love and care for his people.

Jesus spent his life rescuing people—from sickness and disease, from futility, from the cruelty and discrimination of men who made others outcasts. And in the same way, our love has to be freely

at the disposal of folk in need: unreliable, moody, destructive teenagers; young adults obsessed with making their way towards bigger and better, or just "more," things; old people who cannot seem to grasp that the world is not the same as it was in their young days. These, too, are his children.

And not only does the past require periodic analysis—so does this continuing challenge. Peter should have known better what he was letting himself in for, by this point in his life—and so should we! Let me briefly draw your attention to three significant aspects of this task of caring for people, lest our future performance fail to match our good intentions!

*Firstly: sensitivity to needs.* A half-dead body underfoot is pretty inescapable, whatever one's response. But it is so much easier to be insensitive when the problems are not so close at hand. Children are not dying for lack of milk within sight of our eyes—but they are so dying: 11,000 little children every day.

Moreover, even when the need is geographically close at hand, it may not be so blatantly obvious. People simply do not present you with neatly wrapped cellophane packages labelled "problem: for your attention." It takes real sensitivity to perceive the disguised pleas for help of those who act brashly self-assured, or those who are desperately retiring and hesitant because they do not feel worthy to take up your time.

But God knows, we need greater sensitivity. As Bernard Shaw has the executioner say to the little priest who had officiated at the burning of St. Joan, and testified that the actual visual experience of her death was what finally got through to him: "Must then a Christ

perish in every age, to save those who have no imagination?"

*Secondly: felt responsibility for needs.* I had been going to say: "Of course, if you came across the victim of a car wreck, you would wrap him up warmly and phone an ambulance." But apparently even that is not necessarily true.

Kitty Genovese was set upon by a maniac as she returned home from work at 3:00 a.m. And thirty-eight of her neighbors came to their windows when she cried out in terror, but none came to her assistance, even though her assailant took half an hour to murder her. No one so much as called the police! She died.

An eighteen-year-old switchboard operator alone in her office in the Bronx was raped and beaten. Escaping momentarily, she ran naked and bleeding into the streets, screaming for help. A crowd of forty passers-by gathered and watched as, in broad daylight, the rapist tried to drag her back upstairs. No one interfered. Finally two policemen happened by, and arrested him.

If a person is to intervene, he has to notice something is happening, interpret it as a crisis, and decide that he has *personal* responsibility. And there is evidence that at each of these points, the presence of other bystanders may lead a person to "cop" out, and not help. Eloquent testimony to the need for the admonition: "Don't you bother about what John's task is, Peter—you get on with yours!"

*Thirdly: skills to meet the needs.* Granted that we cannot possibly acquire the skills to meet every need—we *can* learn to discriminate the situation where it is incumbent upon us to carry the major load, from those where it is desirable to get additional specialized help, while still continuing to care for the person.

There is no excuse for spiritual butchery—despite the fact that it is harder to sue a man for it than for the surgical kind. And if the sheep that wanders away has either a broken leg, or neurotic dependency needs, we had better not go picking it up and cradling it to our bosom as we attempt to bring it back!

One of the essential safeguards against slap-happy amateurism is the willingness to acquire professional expertise. And part of such professionalism is the scrutiny of discrepancies between one's good intentions, and one's actual performance. It may make for some painful learning experiences—but at that, it's better than having a millstone tied around one's neck and being flung into the sea!

The complexity of the challenging task confronting us is enormous. Yet as Isaiah pointed out long ago: religion and worship that couldn't care less about other people is the ultimate blasphemy. But, "if you pour yourself out for the hungry, and satisfy the needs of the afflicted . . . the Lord will guide you continually."

# Pannenberg's Recent Book on Christology

BRUCE M. METZGER

AMONG recent theological treatises emanating from Germany, Pannenberg's *Jesus—God and Man* will doubtless take a high place.<sup>1</sup> The most significant book on Christology since Emil Brunner's *The Mediator* (German original, 1927; English translation, 1934), this volume represents a fresh and stimulating approach to a time-honored subject.

Formerly at the University of Mainz and now professor of systematic theology at Munich, Pannenberg gathers up into this volume the major themes which he had developed in several previous publications, and elaborates in a singularly impressive manner a comprehensive treatment of most of the important problems of Christology. Pannenberg's theological orientation, set forth in his Introduction, is summarized as follows: "One can only speak about God himself in that at the same time one talks about Jesus. Therefore, theology and Christology, the doctrine of God and the doctrine of Jesus as the Christ, are bound together. It is the goal of theology as well as of Christology to develop this connection" (pp. 19-20).

## I

In the first two chapters Pannenberg deals with methodological and structural problems in Christology. The starting point, he argues, cannot be "from above," from the divinity of Jesus, in-

volving the concept of the incarnation, but must be "from below," and "is concerned first of all with Jesus' message and fate and arrives only at the end at the concept of the incarnation" (p. 33). Accordingly, and with implicit criticism of Bultmann's lack of confidence (and even lack of interest) in our ability to ascertain historical details in the life of Jesus, Pannenberg founds his Christology squarely on the bodily resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

On the basis of critical analysis Pannenberg identifies in the Gospels two traditions, mutually independent and therefore mutually complementing each other: namely, the cycle of traditions concerning Jesus' appearances to his followers in Galilee, and the testimony at Jerusalem regarding the empty tomb. Concerning the latter, Pannenberg quotes with approval the observation of Paul Althaus: "In Jerusalem, the place of Jesus' execution and grave, it was proclaimed not long after his death that he had been raised. The situation *demands* that within the circle of the first community one had a reliable testimony for the fact that the grave had been found empty. [The resurrection *kerigma*] could not have been maintained in Jerusalem for a single day, for a single hour, if the emptiness of the tomb had not been established as a fact for all concerned" (p. 100).

In three main sections that constitute the body of the book, Pannenberg discusses successively (I) our knowledge of Jesus' divinity ("Jesus' unity with God

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus—God and Man*, by Wolfhart Pannenberg (Translated by Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1969. Pp. 415. \$10.00).

was not yet established by the claim implied in his pre-Easter appearance, but only by his resurrection from the dead," p. 53); (II) Jesus the man before God ("as God's revelation, Jesus is at the same time the revelation of the human nature and of the destiny of man" p. 191); and (III) the divinity of Christ and the man Jesus ("Jesus' unity with God is not to be conceived as a unification of two substances, but as this man Jesus is God," p. 283).

In reaction to existentialism (a reaction that is observable also in Jürgen Moltmann's recent *Theology of Hope*) one finds an emphasis on the future, sometimes at the expense of the present. The resurrected Jesus is not now present to the Christian community in the event of the proclamation of the kerygma, but rather has been exalted to heaven where he remains hidden until his return in glory. The result is that "no one now has an experience of him as risen and exalted, at least not an experience that could be distinguished with certainty from illusion. In the Corinthian Gnosticism, Paul battled the illusion that one can *experience* the glory of the exalted Lord in the present. The *experience* of the presence of Christ is promised only for the end of time. Therefore, also, whatever concerns the certainty of the present life of the exalted Lord is based entirely on what happened in the past" (p. 28).

Throughout the volume the author enters into lively debate with Roman and Protestant theologians of the past and the present. Not a few adjunct topics, more or less closely related to the central subject, are explored. For example, the meaning of Jesus' death is defined as vicarious not only for Israel but for all humanity. "Whoever is bound up with Jesus dies, to be sure, but he dies

in hope of the life of resurrection from the dead that has already appeared in Jesus" (p. 263). Jesus' death discloses the effect of divine wrath against sin. "Luther was probably the first since Paul and his school to have seen with full clarity that Jesus' death in its genuine sense is to be understood as vicarious penal suffering" (p. 279). In this connection Pannenberg's interpretation of the beginnings of the patristic concept of Jesus' descent into hell is most suggestive. "To be excluded from God's nearness in spite of clear consciousness of it would be hell. This element agrees remarkably with the situation of Jesus' death: as the one who proclaimed and lived the eschatological nearness of God, Jesus died the death of one rejected. How this contradiction may have expressed itself in Jesus' consciousness remains hidden to our view. But we can see the situation characterized by this knowledge which must have determined his consciousness" (p. 271).

Out of Jesus' surrender to and unity with God proceeds the biblical testimony to his sinlessness, a datum which Pannenberg takes very seriously. "If sin is essentially life in contradiction to God, in self-centered closing of our ego against God, then Jesus' unity with God in his personal community with the Father and in his identity with the person of the Son of God means immediately his separation from all sin. Therefore, the more exact theological understanding of his sinlessness is dependent upon the understanding of his unity with God" (p. 355).

The preceding descriptive comments and quotations will be sufficient to indicate the wealth and scope of this important contribution to the ongoing theological enterprise.



## II

In making a critical assessment of Pannenberg's monograph one must first of all express appreciation for the author's willingness not only to take full cognizance of the historical account of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, but also to permit these data to have a formative influence in the elaboration of a theological position. In the face of the excesses involved in much recent existentialism, with the accompanying tendency to lapse into a modern docetism or twentieth-century gnosticism, Pannenberg's recurring emphasis on the historical Jesus comes as a welcome change in the Germanic theological scene.

Among the shortcomings of what is otherwise a first-rate piece of work is the rather ambivalent manner in which the author discusses the New Testament statements bearing on the pre-existence of Jesus as the eternal Son of God, and his role in the creation of the world. Perhaps the reason for a certain hesitation in dealing with this subject, as well as for the author's repeated criticism of the Chalcedon formulation, arises from a too rigorous adherence to the governing methodology involved in constructing a Christology "from below" and the consequent minimizing of New Testament statements that presuppose a Christology "from above." Thus, though Pannenberg gives repeated attention to the Johannine teaching concerning the Logos, he rather arbitrarily rejects Col. 1:15ff. and Heb. 1:2f. as irrelevant for the doctrine of the creation of the world through Jesus Christ (p. 393).

Likewise there is a certain perversity in Pannenberg's forthright dismissal of the evangelic narratives of the virgin birth of Jesus as legendary and as in-

volved an irreconcilable contradiction with the Christology of the incarnation of the pre-existent Son of God taught by Paul and John. The irreconcilability, however, is of Pannenberg's own making, for he interprets the birth narratives as teaching that "Jesus first *became* God's Son through Mary's conception. According to Paul and John, on the contrary, the Son of God was already pre-existent and then as a pre-existent being had bound himself to the man Jesus" (p. 143).

Apart from the curious way in which Pannenberg expresses himself concerning the pre-existent Son of God "who had bound himself to the man Jesus" (the New Testament, on the contrary, speaks of God's "sending" his Son; Jn. 3:17; Rom. 8:3; Gal. 4:4; I Jn. 4:9f.), it is quite unwarranted to suggest that Matthew and Luke thought that "Jesus first *became* God's Son through Mary's conception." The same evangelists repeatedly put into Jesus' mouth statements which clearly imply his pre-existence, such as "I am come that . . ." (Mt. 5:17; 9:13; 10:34f.; Lk. 12:49, 51; cf. the Johannine-like theologumenon in Mt. 11:27). Curiously enough, Pannenberg's attempted refutation of Karl Barth's position supporting the virgin birth turns out to be based largely on the objection that it places Barth "on the path of Roman Mariolatry" (p. 144). But surely the abuse of anything does not do away with its proper use, and it is to be hoped that in a subsequent edition Pannenberg will give renewed attention to the historical and literary problems involved in satisfactorily explaining the existence of the birth narratives if in fact they do not present in their central content (despite the acknowledged presence of certain midrashic embellishments) a historically and theologically valid affirmation. The

birth narratives, like the resurrection narratives, indicate that Jesus Christ was not limited by the influences of history. The virgin birth of Jesus is the sign and assurance that, in God's provision for the salvation of man, there is both continuity and discontinuity: there is a literal human birth, so that Christ is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and there is also the divine incarnation by which a new beginning is made, and Christ is qualified to be the last Adam, the Head of the new people of God. (This paradox of complete discontinuity, and yet of a real continuity of being, is familiar in any experience of conversion.)<sup>2</sup> In any case, what must be objected to most of all is Pannenberg's cavalier rejection of the birth narratives without having given them the same careful analysis from a historical and literary point of view that he has bestowed upon the resurrection narratives. It may indeed be that, after giving serious attention to the genetic problem (i.e. how did the virgin birth narratives arise if they are not true?), Pannenberg will continue to reject the testimony of the First and the Third Gospels, but at least he will not be open to the charge of having relied upon a priori argumentation that contrasts markedly with the painstaking attention he has devoted to the resurrection narratives.

Another weakness appears in Pannenberg's discussion of Jesus' sinlessness, where he totally neglects to consider the temptation narratives in the Synoptic Gospels. If Pannenberg should plead that he is a theologian and not an exegete, it is still passing strange that he makes no mention of such important theological discussions concerning the testing of God's Son as those recently

published by J. A. T. Robinson, Ulrich Mauser, E. Fascher, and R. Schnackenburg, as well as the relatively exhaustive monographs on the patristic exposition of the temptation pericopes by K. P. Köppen and M. Steiner. (The important studies on Jesus' temptation by B. Gerhardsson, E. Best, and J. Dupont appeared too late for consideration in the German edition, which was first published in 1963 and slightly revised in 1966.)

Finally, it must be mentioned that, despite the impressive dimensions of Pannenberg's treatment of his subject (especially on the theological, if not the exegetical side), it will be obvious to the discerning reader that once again we have in this book an example of what Johannes Munck in another connection described as German scholarship in distinction to international scholarship. Not only does Pannenberg himself admit in his Preface to the English edition that he has neglected the research of J.N.D. Kelly, G. L. Prestige, and R. V. Sellers in the patristic field of Christological research, but he likewise takes no account of the varied contributions to Christology published by such British and American scholars as P. T. Forsyth, John Knox, J. S. Lawton, H. R. Mackintosh, T. W. Manson, W. Manson, A. E. J. Rawlinson, and V. Taylor, to name but a few who have devoted serious consideration to the study of Christology.

Despite the preceding strictures and criticisms, however, it should be reiterated that Pannenberg has written what, on any estimate, must be regarded as a first-rate contribution to the literature on Christology.

<sup>2</sup> In this connection see the suggestive article by O. A. Piper entitled "The Virgin Birth; the Meaning of the Gospel Accounts," in the journal *Interpretation*, vol. 18 (1964), pp. 131-148. Piper argues, among other points, that "the Virgin Birth is not an isolated and incredible 'nature miracle.' Rather, it is an event through which God reveals to mankind the pattern of those redemptive acts by which salvation becomes a historical reality" (p. 147).

# A Checklist of Works in Hymnody

SAMUEL J. ROGAL

THE books and articles below represent a survey of the scholarship in hymnody. I have omitted works concerned with specific hymn writers only because separate bibliographic studies of such major figures as Watts, Doddridge, and the Wesleys currently exist. Therefore, this list is directed to those students and scholars concerned with the more general aspects of the history and development of the hymn in Britain (including Scotland and Ireland) and the United States.

A careful study of the dates of the entries in this listing reveals a simple truism about hymnic scholarship: the current decade seems to have produced next to nothing in contrast to the prolificacy of the nineteenth century and the first thirty or so years of the twentieth. Immediately, one might argue that the quality and quantity of the work produced by John Julian, Louis Fitzgerald Benson, Waldo Selden Pratt, and Henry Wilder Foote have created an inborn inferiority complex on the part of potential scholars of hymnody. However, the lamp of superior scholarship usually serves to kindle the desires of lesser souls, not extinguish them. Essentially, contemporary hymnody exists in a state of transition; its scholars seem to be waiting for a definite sense of direction before they renew their activities. They no longer appear willing to continue discussions of and explorations into nineteenth, eighteenth, and seventeenth century traditions. After all, what else can be said upon digesting the likes of Benson's *The English Hymn*:

*Its Development and Use in Worship* or Foote's *Three Centuries of American Hymnody*! Perhaps fresh impetus for study and research will come with the publication of such truly contemporary projects as an *American Dictionary of Hymnology*, directed by Leonard Ellinwood under the sponsorship of the American Hymn Society.

Merely for ease in locating the various works, I have divided this checklist into two categories: those books and articles published in the United States and those published in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Not all entries are first editions. Whenever a work has simply been reprinted (such as Julian's *Dictionary* or Benson's *The English Hymn*), I have cited the original publication date; if a work has undergone significant revision or addition (such as Foote's *Three Centuries of American Hymnody*), I have cited the latest date of publication. Again, my general purpose in presenting this material is to facilitate locating a particular book, monograph, or article. Finally, to expand—indirectly—the general bibliography in this area, I have included as many works as possible in which the authors themselves appended fairly extensive bibliographies and checklists.

## 1. United States

Adams, F. A. "Congregational Singing." *The New Englander*, February, 1849.

Benson, Louis Fitzgerald. *The English Hymn: Its Development and Use in Worship*. New York, 1915.

- Benson, Louis Fitzgerald. *The Hymnody of the Christian Church*. New York, 1927.
- . *Studies of Familiar Hymns*. Philadelphia, 1903.
- Bird, F. M. "Lutheran Hymnology." *The Evangelical Quarterly Review*, January, 1865, p. 219.
- Blair, Samuel. *A Discourse on Psalmody*. Philadelphia, 1789.
- Breed, D. R. *History and the Use of Hymns and Hymn Tunes*. Chicago, 1903.
- Brown, Theron and Hezekiah Butterworth. *The Story of the Hymns and Tunes*. New York, 1906.
- Buchanan, Annabel Morris. *Folk Hymns of America*. New York, 1938.
- Burrage, H. S. *Baptist Hymn Writers and Their Hymns*. Portland, Maine, n.d.
- "Church Music." *The Princeton Review*, January, 1843, pp. 89-91.
- Committee on Historical Research of the Pennsylvania Society of the Colonial Dames of America. *Church Music and Musical Life in Pennsylvania in the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia, 1926-1928.
- Crawford, Benjamin Franklin. *Religious Trends in a Century of Hymns*. Carnegie, Pa., 1937.
- Creamer, David. *Methodist Hymnology*. New York, 1848.
- Daggett, Oliver E. "The New Hymn Book." *The New Englander*, July, 1846.
- . "The Psalms in Worship." *The New Englander*, July, 1846, p. 328.
- Dickinson, Edward. "The Lesson of the New Hymnals." *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1900, p. 571.
- . *Music in the History of the Western Church*. New York, 1902.
- Douglas, Winifred. *Church Music in History and Practice*. New York, 1937.
- Duffield, S. W. *English Hymns: Their Authors and History*. New York, 1886.
- Edwards, Jonathan. *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New England*. Boston, 1742.
- Eliot, S. A. *Heralds of a Liberal Faith*. Boston, 1910.
- Fields, Annie. *Authors and Friends*. Boston, 1896.
- Foote, Arthur II. *Henry Wilder Foote, Hymnologist*. The Hymn Society of America. New York, 1968.
- Foote, Henry Wilder. *American Unitarian Hymn Writers and Hymns*. Hymn Society of America. New York, 1959.
- . *American Universalist Hymn Writers and Hymns*. American Hymn Society. New York, 1959.
- . "The Bay Psalm Book and Harvard Hymnody." *Harvard Theological Review*, October, 1940.
- . *A Descriptive Catalogue of American Unitarian Hymn Books*. Boston, 1938.
- . "The Ethics of Hymn Tinkering." *Religion in Life*, Winter, 1942.
- . "The Harvard School of Hymnody." *The British Unitarian Historical Society Transactions*, III (1924).
- . "The Music and Poetry of the Bay Psalm Book." *The Christian Register*, September 15, 1940.
- . "The Task of the Hymn Book Editor." *The Hymn*, XIII, Nos. 3-4 (October, 1957).
- . "The Tercentenary of the Bay Psalm Book." *The Christian Century*, April 24, 1940.
- . *Three Centuries of American Hymnody*. New York, 1968.



- Hatfield, E. F. *The Poets of the Church*. New York, 1884.
- Hemenway, F. D. and Charles M. Stuart. *Gospel Singers and Their Songs*. New York, 1891.
- Hood, George. *A History of Music in New England*. Boston, 1846.
- Horder, W. Garrett. *The Treasury of American Sacred Song*. New York, 1896.
- Jackson, George Pullen. *Spiritual Folk Songs of Early America*. New York, 1927.
- Lapsley, R. A. *The Songs of Zion: A Brief Study of Our Hymns*. Richmond, Va., 1925.
- Macauley, Rose. *Some Religious Elements in English Literature*. New York, 1931.
- MacLean, J. P. *A Bibliography of Shaker Literature*. Columbus, Ohio, 1905.
- McCutchan, R. G. *Our Hymnody*. New York, 1937.
- McDormand, Thomas B. and Frederic S. Crossman. *Judson Concordance to Hymns*. Valley Forge, Pa., 1965.
- Metcalf, Frank J. *American Psalmody or Titles of Books Containing Tunes Printed in America from 1721 to 1820*. New York, 1917.
- . *American Writers and Compilers of Sacred Music*. New York, 1925.
- Nevin, J. W. *The Liturgical Question*. Philadelphia, 1862.
- "The New Hymn Book." *The Quarterly Review of the M.E. Church, South*, January, 1848, pp. 69-131.
- Ninde, Edward S. *Story of the American Hymn*. New York, 1921.
- Nutter, Charles S. *Hymn Studies*. New York, 1884.
- , and Wilbur F. Tillett. *The Hymns and Hymn Writers of the Church*. Nashville, 1911.
- Peters, John E. *The Psalms as Liturgies*. New York, 1922.
- Pfatteicher, Helen E. and Ruth Ellis Messenger. *A Short Bibliography for the Study of Hymns*. The American Hymn Society. New York, 1964.
- Phillips, Philip. *Song Pilgrimage Around the World*. Chicago, 1880.
- Poteat, Herbert McNeill. *Practical Hymnology*. Boston, 1921.
- Pratt, Waldo Selden. "The Earliest New England Music." *Unitarian Historical Society*, I (1937), 37-38.
- . *The Music of the French Psalter of 1562*. New York, 1939.
- . *The Music of the Pilgrims*. Boston, 1921.
- . *Musical Ministries in the Church*. New York, 1901.
- Price, Carl F. *The Music and Hymnody of the Methodist Hymnal*. New York, 1911.
- Putnam, Alfred P. *Singers and Songs of the Liberal Faith*. Boston, 1875.
- Ritter, F. L. *Music in America*. New York, 1895.
- Rogal, Samuel J. "Hymnals Published in England and Scotland: 1660-1800." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LXI (Winter 1968), 61-68.
- Ross, James H. *Hymns and Singers of the Y.M.C.A.* Boston, 1901.
- Sachse, Julius F. *The Music of the Ephrata Cloister*. Lancaster, Pa., 1903.
- Saintsbury, George. *A History of English Prosody*. New York, 1908.
- Sankey, Ira David. *Story of the Gospel Hymns*. Philadelphia, 1906.
- Schaff, Philip and A. Gilman. *A Library of Religious Poetry*. New York, 1881.
- Spaeth, A. "Liturgical Development of the Ministerium." *Lutheran Church Review*, January 1898, p. 116.

- Symmes, Thomas. *The Reasonableness of Regular Singing*. Boston, 1720.
- Thompson, J. B. "Hymns of the Church." *The Christian Intelligencer*, July 25, 1906.
- Thorndike, S. Lathrop. "The Psalmodies of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay." *Colonial Society of Massachusetts Transactions*, I (1894), 228-238.
- Tillett, Wilbur F. *Our Hymns and Their Authors*. Nashville, 1889.
- Warrington, James. *Short Titles of Books Relating to the History and Practice of Psalmody in the U.S.* Philadelphia, 1898.
- Wheatley, R. "The Revised Methodist Hymnal." *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, July 1879, p. 529.
- White, William. *Thoughts on the Singing of Psalms and Anthems*. Philadelphia, 1808.
- II. England, Scotland, Ireland
- Bonar, Horatius. *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*. London, 1866.
- Boyd, A.H.K. "The New Hymnology of the Scottish Kirk." *Blackwood Magazine*, May 1889.
- A Brief List of Hymn Books, for Sale by Charles Higham*. London, 1893.
- Brownlie, John. *The Hymns and Hymn Writers of the Church Hymnary*. Edinburgh, n.d.
- Bumpus, J. S. *English Cathedral Music*. London, n.d.
- Campbell, Duncan. *Hymns and Hymn Makers*. London, 1898.
- Cowan, William and James Love. *The Music of the Church Hymnary and the Psalter in Metre, Its Sources and Composers*. Edinburgh, 1901.
- Curwen, J. S. *Studies in Worship Music*. London, n.d.
- Dearmer, Percy. *Songs of Praise Discussed*. London, 1933.
- Dick, W. *The Hymnary Discussions in the General Assembly*. Belfast, 1899.
- Fleming, J. R. *The Highway of Praise*. London, 1937.
- Fox, Adam. *English Hymns and Hymn Writers*. London, 1947.
- Gadsby, John. *Hymn Writers*. London, 1870.
- Gibson, James. *The Public Worship of God: Hymns and Hymn Books*. London, 1869.
- Gillman, Frederick John. *The Evolution of the English Hymn*. London, 1927.
- . *The Songs and Singers of Christendom*. London, 1911.
- . *The Story of Our Hymns*. London, 1921.
- Glass, H. A. *The Story of the Psalters*. London, 1888.
- Gray, J. *An Inquiry into Historical Facts Relative to Parochial Psalmody*. York, 1821.
- Gregory, A. E. *The Hymn Book of the Modern Church*. London, 1904.
- Hamilton, James. *The Psalter and the Hymn Book*. London, 1865.
- Harper, Edward. *Strictures on Hymns Ancient and Modern*. London, n.d.
- Holder, W. G. *The Hymn Lover*. London, 1905.
- . "The Theology of Our Hymns." *The Outlook*, September 11, 1897.
- Hoskins, E. *Sarum and York Primers, with Kindred Books*. London, 1901.
- Julian, John. *A Dictionary of Hymnology*. London, 1907.
- King, James. *Anglican Hymnology*. London, 1885.
- Kinloch, T. F. *An Historical Account of the Church Hymnary*. Cambridge, 1928.
- Lightwood, J. T. *Hymn Tunes and Their Story*. London, n.d.
- Lynch, T. T. "Review of the Rivulet

- Controversy." *The Monthly Spectator*, November 1856, p. 701.
- MacLagan, D. J. *The Scottish Paraphrases*. Edinburgh, 1889.
- MacLean, Donald. *London at Worship, 1689-90*. Manchester, 1929.
- McCrie, Charles G. *The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1892.
- Marlow, Isaac. *A Brief Discourse Concerning Singing*. . . . London, 1690.
- Martin, G. Currie. *The Church and the Hymn Writers*. London, 1928.
- Miller, Josiah. *Singers and Songs of the Church*. London, 1869.
- Montgomery, James. *The Christian Psalmist*. Glasgow, 1825.
- Neale, J. Mason. "Hymns for Public Worship." *The Christian Remembrancer*, January 1843, p. 46.
- Patrick, Millar. *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody*. Edinburgh, 1949.
- . *The Story of the Church's Song*. Edinburgh, 1927.
- Phillips, C. S. *Hymnody Past and Present*. London, 1937.
- Proctor, Francis. *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*. London, 1898.
- Romaine, William. *An Essay on Psalmody*. London, 1775.
- Rust, Cyprian T. *Break of Day in the Eighteenth Century: a History and a Specimen of Its First Book of English Sacred Song*. London, 1880.
- Sampson, George. *The Century of Divine Songs*. London, 1943.
- Scholes, Percy. *The Puritans and Music*. London, 1934.
- Sedgwick, Daniel. *A Comprehensive Index of Names of Original Authors and Translators of Psalms and Hymns*. . . . London, 1860.
- Sprott, G. W. *The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Stevenson, George J. *The Methodist Hymn Book and Its Associations*. London, 1869.
- Taunton, Ethelred L. *The History and Growth of Church Music*. London, n.d.
- Taylor, William Lawrence. *Catalogue of the Taylor Collection of Psalm Versions*. Aberdeen, 1921.
- Todd, H. J. *Observations upon the Metrical Version of the Psalms*. London, 1822.
- Welch, Adam C. *The Psalter in Life, Worship and History*. Oxford, 1926.
- Whitley, W. T. *Congregational Hymn Singing in England*. London, 1933.
- Wilmot, Robert Aris. *English Sacred Poetry of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Eighteenth, Nineteenth Centuries*. London, 1862.
- Wright, Thomas. *The Lives of the British Hymn Writers*. London, 1914.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Service in Christ: Essays Presented to Karl Barth on his 80th Birthday*, ed. by James I. McCord and T.H.L. Parker. W. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1967. Pp. 223, \$6.95.

On the occasion of his seventieth birthday a group of younger British theologians presented Karl Barth with a book of essays on Christology as a token of their affection and a sign of their indebtedness to him as teacher and friend. It is regrettable that this valuable collection of essays is no longer obtainable in the stores since the book is already out of print. In partial compensation, we now have another work on Christology, inspired once more by Karl Barth, and again written in honor of him and presented, this time, on his eightieth birthday. The majority of the writers of the essays are from Britain, some of them having contributed to the earlier volume; but there are also contributions from scholars in Australia and the United States.

The theme of the book is in the title. It is an examination of what *diakonia*, service in Christ, is understood to be today as seen in the perspective of the Scriptures and the history of the Church. As the editors say: their plan is to continue the explication of Christology, begun in the previous volume, as the central doctrine of theology. But whereas the earlier essays dealt with Christ as the subject of an active faith, this collection is to deal with Christ as the ground of a faithful activity directed toward God and the neighbor. In the words of the Foreword: "We do not leave Christology to write about *diakonia*, but we are trying to understand what it means that, because Christ the Head is the servant, the Church which is His body is both His servant and the servant of mankind." Several of the essays make explicit reference to the fact that inspiration for following this direction in Christology has come from Karl Barth, particularly from his treatment of the subject of service in Christ that appears in the *Church Dogmatics*, Book IV, especially part 3.

The book opens with a searching inquiry into the theological meaning of service in

Christ by the Scottish theologian, Thomas F. Torrance. His essay provides a very helpful bridge between the two themes of active faith in Christ and faithful activity in him; or at least it provides a worthy opportunity to discuss the relations between these themes. One finds little difficulty in making the distinction with the author between the general ministry of all members of Christ's body that is born of love, and the special ministry of some members that is born also of "obedience to a specific commission from her Lord and with the definitive authority of that commission behind them." But one does experience difficulty in following the elaboration of this distinction into a preference for actions which flow from "obedience" over actions which arise out of the spontaneity of love. It seems to the reviewer to be a theological error, and an attempt to make virtue out of necessity, to treat a work of love addressed to God or man in obedience to a divine commandment as ultimately superior to a work of love that arises spontaneously from a loving heart. We learned long ago from Reinhold Niebuhr, and remained convinced of its truth, that genuine love is impossible in response to a command, even as we also learned from him and others that it was when man fell that God set over-against him as demand what he offered as grace originally in creation and redemptively in Jesus Christ, *viz.* the freedom and spontaneity of a life in love. However, since all who are called to service in Christ are *simul justus, simul peccator*, the continuing dialectic between obedience and love, between commandment and grace, is essential to Christian faith and life. Therefore, not as ultimate principle but as penultimate realism, we can agree with Torrance's statement: "He gives what he commands and commands what he gives. He commands a service of love, and He gives the love that empowers that service. It is this inner relation between commandment and love, or between 'authority' and 'charity,' that is so distinctive of service in Jesus Christ" (p. 3).

In the development of his theme, the author is led to assert a two-fold ministry of God in Jesus Christ: "the service of the Word" and "the service of response to the Word." "The



service of the Word serves Christ clothed with His Gospel . . . The service of response to the Word serves Christ clothed with the misery of man." There should be no quarrel with much that the author says about Jesus Christ as the object of our faith and love, and about our service in him being a service of faith and love. But one does find questionable the view that appears here, and in other essays in the book, that Christ is the true object of the love bestowed upon the needy neighbor, either because it is in obedience to Christ's command that we serve him, or because Christ has made himself one with the neighbor in his need. Are we not right in feeling that in this view God dehumanizes man to the extent that the Christian is required to use him as an occasion for service to God? Is Kierkegaard not rather right when he sees God in Jesus Christ as the middle term between the Christian and his neighbor, so that it is truly the neighbor we love, albeit with the love with which God in Christ has loved us? Yet the main thrust of Torrance's argument is surely right: "The Church cannot be in Christ without being in Him as He is proclaimed to men in their need and without being in Him as He encounters us in and behind the existence of every man in his need" (p. 9).

In this opening chapter of the book we are provided with a helpful, even if provocative, context for the elaboration of the theme of service in Christ that follows. The other essays deal with Christ's servanthood and ours in biblical, historical, and contemporary perspectives. An account is given of attitudes and assumptions with respect to service to the needy in the classical world, of the care of the poor in the Old Testament and of *diakonia* in the New Testament and the early Church. The understanding of *diakonia* in certain leaders of the Reformation is preceded by an account of Mediaeval charities and followed by a descriptive analysis of *diakonia* in post-reformation Christian thought and life down to modern times. Then come chapters on the diaconal ministry in contemporary Anglican, Roman Catholic, Reformed and Methodist churches and on the relation between secular and ecclesial understandings of ministry to needy men in our time.

It is inevitable that there should be some repetition as various authors seek to explore from one or other of these perspectives the

common theme of the nature of Christian life in Christ, who was *the* Servant of God, and the servant nature of the Church which is his Body. Yet it is remarkable how fresh, interesting and informative the discussion remains throughout the book. And how up-to-date the whole discussion is! Many of the questions that are at the forefront of theological discussion today echo and re-echo throughout the pages of the book. What is the relation between the act of faith and the work of love, between the worship of God and the service of man? Is the humanitarian service of one's fellows an inferior act of love toward the neighbor in comparison with the service of his need that flows from an active faith in Christ? Is it possible for unbelieving men to surpass the Christian community in their effective service of the poor? May the Church be content to see its concern for the needy met by instruments of a secular state or must it also provide, through instruments of its own, services on behalf of the poor and the suffering? Is the Church justified in preserving any kinds of wealth and property for the purposes of serving the believing community, or should it sell all that it has and give the profit to the poor? Is there any justification for the Church to exist as a Holy Community in separation from, perhaps over-against, society at large, or is the Church only rightly conceived as the servant people of a Servant Lord that wills to lose its life and self-identity in the service of mankind? May the Church engage in the power struggle of political action to achieve a political *diakonia* or must it seek only the *diakonia* of voluntary social action? Is there need, either in terms of the theological understanding of proper Church order, or in terms of pragmatic efficacy, for a special ministry of deacons in the Church, or is the diaconate in principle a form of ministry that belongs only to the whole Church? These questions, and many others like them, are raised and discussed in the book. Of course, the answers to them do not always agree. For the essays are not marked by a common theological understanding, but only by a serious theological intention, and a common centre in Jesus Christ.

Some will regret that more help is not given in the book toward answering the knotty ecumenical problem of the diaconate as a special order of ministry in the Church. Others will commend the book for not keep-

ing the question of Church order so central to the discussion of *diakonia*. It is somewhat surprising to find the Archbishop of Canterbury not more unhappy than he appears to be with the view of the deacon, predominant at present in Anglican thought, as an apprentice-priest. It is also remarkable to find how close the account of deacon in the Methodist Church today is to the modern view of the diaconate that has come from Vatican II.

Although the view is nowhere made explicit in the book, I believe considerable indirect support may be found for the suggestion that many of the special forms of the ordained ministry as conceived today, in distinction from the ministry of Word and sacrament, could rightfully be thought to belong to the office and function of deacon, as a special order in the Church. Prison and hospital chaplaincies, social service clinics, departments of denominational headquarters manned by secretaries that deal with education, finance and relief of distress—all these have to do with the diaconal ministry of the Church according to biblical witness and historical understanding as outlined in this book. Ordination to such ministries as these, as a life-time vocation in response to the call of God's Spirit, would no more call into question, as more than one writer in the book fears it might, the serving ministry of all who are in Christ, than the special ministry of Word and sacrament calls into question the responsibility of every Christian to witness to the Gospel of Christ. Both forms of ordained ministry should serve to challenge and prepare every Christian for the kind of participation in the servant ministry of Jesus Christ that nature, grace and historical destiny offer to them. However, as some authors in the book are at pains to point out, there is no biblical or theological justification for that view of the deacon that developed in the West, where the deacon is thought to be a ministering servant of bishops and priests, symbolizing Christ in his servant role, while these others represent him in his kingly and priestly roles. All forms of ministry, deriving from Christ, are in form and content serving ministries, and should have the appearance of being so. What distinguishes the diaconate as a special ministry from pastoral, preaching, and teaching forms is that the former aims at the relief of concrete instances of physical and psychic distress, while the latter

serves the proclamation of the Word of God. Persuasive things are said here about the need to link the diaconal service of God and man in the world to the liturgical service of God and man in the worship of the Church, so that worship and life, faith in Christ and service in Christ, may have a common origin and end in the grace of God.

WILLIAM O. FENNELL

Emmanuel College,  
Toronto, Canada.

*Christian Theology and Metaphysics*, by Peter R. Baelz. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Penna., 1968. Pp. vi + 146. \$1.75.

At a time when the reality of God is problematic to many Christians and when there are proposals by a host of theologians to get rid of much of Christian theology as excess baggage, this little book contains much good sense. Rather than trying to reduce the size of the pill which sticks in our throats, the author seeks both to enlarge and to sharpen our vision of what it is to be in relationship to God.

The basic idea with which he works is to call attention to an underlying structure in all of our experience, viz. that we are in relationship to things and persons, and in addition we have a vague but pervasive awareness of being "beholden." This is not meant as an argument to convince people that there is a God, but represents the subsequent reflection of a believer on the kind of object with which religious faith is related. Throughout the book there is an awareness that God is God; he is not precisely like anything else with which we deal, and hence no straightforward argument or recipe will uncover him for us.

There are several difficulties in the account, however. The "structure of experience" he describes is either trivial, or when not trivial, very problematic. It needs considerable critical examination and much shoring up to bear the weight it is called upon to carry. For example, he works with a view of matter as inert and passive, but this view is not held by materialists today. A richer view of what it is that matter is or may be, would require considerable re-working of his view of the structure of experience and also cause the

removal of the loaded language of Chapter Two, which virtually forces one to opt for belief in God since the only alternative seems to be a brute irrational universe.

The title is misleading as it is not a full scale study of metaphysics and its relationship to Christianity, but an account of the incapability of some metaphysical reflection and commitment in Christianity. It is also not clear for whom the book is intended. It is sprinkled with technical words, distinctions, and allusions to philosophers and theologians which would make it hard going for the untrained. On the other hand, it is not rigorous enough for those who are trained in philosophy and theology.

DIOGENES ALLEN

*Religion and Understanding*, ed. by D. Z. Phillips. Macmillan Company, New York, N.Y., 1967. Pp. vii + 217. \$5.95.

This is an admirable collection of eleven articles in the philosophy of religion, most of which were written within the last ten years and all but one of which have been previously published. As the editor of the collection rightly points out philosophers (whether believers or not) have generally been concerned with the *grounds* for religious beliefs; they have taken it that they know well-enough what they mean. These essays, either directly or indirectly, challenge this assumption by showing the enormous effort and skill it takes to understand some very familiar religious affirmations. They also exhibit the difference understanding makes for assessing their grounds, for in religion there is a particularly close relationship between what is claimed by a religion and the grounds for the claim. Because of this stress on understanding, unlike much work in the philosophy of religion, some of these articles have the effect of deepening one's own life and not just increasing one's store of information.

Perhaps the most successful in this respect are the essays by Norman Kemp Smith and J. R. Jones. Smith, the great Kantian scholar, begins by reflecting on the puzzling conjunction in Hume and Kant of their devastating criticisms of the Argument to Design and at the same time of their reverence for the order of the universe. With

great skill he conveys something of the impression that the universe often makes on us, and claims that this impression is not to be used to frame an argument or to make an inference, but that it is itself an awareness of the mystery called the Divine. Jones follows a similar course, although he uses as his guide Paul's remark "... for now we see through a glass darkly ..." to develop the way understanding and commitment are found in religion. The transcendent mystery of God is powerfully presented by both men.

The topics covered and the methods used by the other articles are quite diverse, although all relate to the matter of understanding religion. Peter Winch's essay on the difficulty of studying witchcraft in a primitive society shows how the concept of rationality is moulded by our own society and is not a final court of appeals easily wielded in studying what is strange or alien. R. F. Holland's article on miracles deserves careful study, especially for his examination of Hume's famous attack on miracles and because of our own embarrassment with miracles today. (It is relevant to the demythologizing debate). Malcolm's article on Anselm's Ontological Argument, which has provoked an avalanche of papers, probably will leave those who are unacquainted with this controversy unenlightened, while those who are familiar with it do not need this paper in such a collection. Several selections are clearly influenced by the contemporary philosophical movement known as "Linguistic Analysis," but only the two articles by Poteat are in the style of lengthy presentations of the analysis of the meaning of words. Anshutz' dialogue, first published in 1934, is very dated, but the contrast it makes with the other selections illustrates the extent to which philosophic reflection on religion has shifted in recent years, even though virtually every line of argument found in the dialogue still re-occurs today. There is a long paper on the Devil by Collingwood, a topic rarely discussed today, and two papers by the editor, the first of which is a study of the inter-relationship between understanding and faith.

Taken together, these essays illuminate the complexity of the relationship of philosophy and science to religion, as well as demonstrate the value of philosophic reflection about religion. Most of them are very readable and



all are of a high quality, although the Poteat articles cover too much of the same ground. Although not elementary, nearly all can be recommended to those who have only a slight knowledge of philosophy of religion. The editor is to be commended for a splendid anthology.

DIOGENES ALLEN

Leibniz: *Theodicy*, ed. by Diogenes Allen. The Library of Liberal Arts. Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., New York, N.Y., 1967. Pp. xix + 176. \$2.75 (paper).

Professor Allen formerly of York University and now of Princeton Theological Seminary has performed a worthwhile service to the study of philosophy and theology by this edition of the *Theodicy*. For a long time students of Leibniz have been exposed to Loemker's two volume work which contains the *Monadology* and other writings, but not the *Theodicy*. Students of logic and mathematics are likewise familiar with the studies of scholars such as Russell and more recently Rescher. Allen's edition, an abridgement of Austin Farrer's 1952 work, fills an important gap. In addition to providing the beginning student with an excellent introduction to one of the few works Leibniz ever completed, the editor has done a good editorial job. The essential merit of which is the elimination of digressive and non-essential material without sacrificing that basic unity which is necessary to a proper understanding of the *Theodicy*.

The very composition of the work commends itself. The original division is retained. There is the Preface, the Preliminary Dissertation on the Conformity of Faith with Reason, and The Freedom of Man in the Origin of Evil (parts 1-3). It is well known in philosophy circles that the *Theodicy* is a work aimed at vindicating the justice of God. It is concerned with two themes: the first, that this is the best of all possible worlds; and the second, that God and evil exist. Following the traditional view that religion is a question of faith rather than reason, Leibniz concludes that one can know there is a God. His lengthy arguments for the existence of God and his discussion of evil may be summarized as follows:

(i) God chose our world from an infinite number of worlds because it is the best of all

possible worlds; (ii) Good and Evil exist. The existence of evil is a test of character. However, "God is no more the cause of sin than the river's current is the cause of the retardation of the boat"; (iii) Every event in the universe serves as a link in a chain (an illusion to the monadology); and (iv) Perfect happiness is not realizable on earth, but in a perfect place—heaven.

Admittedly Leibniz's position is not altogether modern; nevertheless it is of great historical interest. As the editor has rightly pointed out in the Introduction, Leibniz's position is that "in order to hold Christian beliefs one only need to turn back objections, one need not prove the beliefs" (p. vii). The *Theodicy* shows quite convincingly that for Leibniz the metaphysics is related to his theology and the *Theodicy* complements the *Monadology*. A careful study of the *Theodicy* is indispensable therefore to a proper understanding of his system.

With this in mind it is my belief that this volume will prove most useful to students of philosophy and theology, and given the careful editing, there is no reason why it should not become the standard edition for some time to come.

HECTOR J. MASSEY

York University,  
Toronto, Canada

*Das Alte Testament und Jesus Christus*, by Claus Westermann. Calwer Verlag, 1968. Pp. 52. DM 4.80.

In brief compass Claus Westermann, Professor of Old Testament at the University of Heidelberg, has made an important contribution to our understanding of the meaning of the Old Testament in relation to Jesus Christ. It is too bad that the *Buchlein* is not immediately available in English.

Westermann maintains that it is inadequate for Christians to seek a "punctiliar" relation of the Old Testament to the Christian gospel by invoking favorite "messianic" passages, such as the alleged *protoevangelium* of Genesis 3:15, or the Immanuel passage of Isaiah 7:14, or even Isaiah 53. His thesis is that the Old Testament is a book of history—a history set in motion, accompanied, and directed by God to its goal, and therefore the witness of the Old Testament to Christ must be broad-



ened out to a basis as wide as the Old Testament itself. He shows perceptively how the *whole* Old Testament—the prophetic literature, the historical books, the psalms of praise and lament, and wisdom writings—bear witness to Jesus Christ. He does this without “Christianizing” the Old Testament by means of allegory or other forms of eisegesis. He is a faithful advocate of the Protestant principle of the historical meaning of the text (*sensus litteralis*).

If you cannot read German, see if you can find a *Deutscher* to help you, or pray that this will come out in English soon! In this paperback Westermann’s form-critical studies come to a focus and make Advent and Christmas more profoundly meaningful.

BERNHARD W. ANDERSON

*Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, by James Barr. Oxford University Press (Clarendon), New York, N.Y., 1968. Pp. x + 354. \$9.00.

“Textual discussion [in the Old Testament] does not arise primarily from the existence of variant readings [as in the New Testament], but from the perception of difficulties in the Hebrew text” (p. 5). Because of this fact the philological treatment of textual difficulties predominates in the critical analysis of Old Testament passages, with special emphasis on the use of cognate languages like Arabic, Aramaic, Accadian and Ugaritic which may throw light on the meaning or form of the difficult Hebrew term.

In this book Professor Barr of Manchester brings together many of these philological notes which are scattered throughout numerous technical journals, and discusses the principles which underlie this process. He considers such questions as the degree of coincidence in the vocabularies of cognate languages, the extent of homonymy in Hebrew, the history of the transmission of meanings in Hebrew and the value of the ancient translations.

The author does not offer many philological treatments of his own, since he is more interested in elucidating the criteria by which the hundreds of examples he discusses can be sifted and evaluated. The various chapters of

the book discuss these different criteria which are applicable to the cited examples.

For instance, it is recognized that, basic to sound philological work, resulting in new identifications and clarification of difficult passages, is the knowledge of comparative Semitic linguistics, with special reference to phonology, morphology and semantics (Chaps. 4-5). Not only are many difficult forms in the Hebrew text explained by comparative philology, but many new words emerge as homonyms which had become “concealed or forgotten through mistaken identification with the more familiar, or had otherwise fallen into disuse” (Chap. 6).

Another rewarding area for philological research, long unrecognized and little worked, is the vocabulary of post-biblical Hebrew, including Jewish Aramaic. Many new words for things and actions, not found in the Old Testament itself, appear in the much more extensive vocabulary of late Jewish literature; and “restoration” of biblical words in a new context which are not necessarily identical in meaning with the biblical sense can be made (Chap. 9). One is reminded here of the lexical revolution in modern Israel, where classical Hebrew words are used to express new, though not unrelated, concepts.

Evidence from the versions, especially the Septuagint and the Targums, is taken into account (Chap. 10), and other factors like onomatopoea, parallelism and religious and cultural elements are considered in the philological treatment of Old Testament passages (Chap. 11).

Included at the end of the book are a general bibliography, relevant to the questions discussed in the text, and a most valuable “Index of Examples” which is an alphabetic listing of Hebrew words (334 in number) treated philologically in scientific journals and commentaries in recent years. This list was compiled with the assistance of Dr. Terence Fretheim, a graduate student in Old Testament at the time at Princeton Theological Seminary.

A magnificent study like this shows why the knowledge of the original languages is so important for the biblical student. It is sometimes argued that improved modern translations and commentaries are making linguistic study less necessary than it used to be. On the contrary, increased philological knowledge,

while it has enabled us to overcome certain difficulties which the older translations had, makes it more imperative for the student to be able to judge critically between acceptable or fanciful philological suggestions. This critical judgment can be attained only by a thorough knowledge of Hebrew and Greek.

Professor Barr's clear style, penetrating insights, and prodigious linguistic knowledge are evident on every page of this book. The world of biblical scholarship is again indebted to him for breaking new ground in the difficult field of philological research.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

*Elder and Younger Brothers—the Encounter of Jews and Christians*, by A. Roy Eckardt. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, N.Y., 1967. Pp. xx + 188. \$4.95.

The author is professor at Lehigh University, where he is the chairman of the Department of Religion. Professor Eckardt wrote this book after some twenty-five years' study of Jewish-Christian relations, and the purpose he set out to accomplish is to help to break down the barrier between Christians and Jews and to advance brotherly thinking and action on the part of Christians in their association with Jews. He calls his book a work on Christian theological ethics, and he hopes that it will be judged on this basis. He maintains, however, that he is an orthodox Christian.

The book consists of three parts, in the first of which he discusses anti-Semitism in disclosure. In the second he deals with the mystery of the people of Israel, and Israel and the Church; under the latter he considers both continuity and discontinuity. In the third division under dialectical ventures he treats the subjects of mystery, ideology, and pathology, Biblical dilemmas, and the unfolding covenant.

He regards anti-Semitism as meaning the hatred and denigration of the Jewish people, but when directed also against the Jewish religion the term furthermore includes anti-Judaism. He points out that anti-Semitism grew out of a reputedly Christian society, and he maintains that Christendom's traditional antipathy to the Jews gave support to an environment where hatred of Jews could grow

and persist. It is obvious that the Christian faith rests upon the foundation of the Old Testament and that historically Jesus was a Jew; yet according to the author no other people has ever been subjected to the persecutions that the Jewish people have suffered within Christendom.

It is well known that the covenant made by God with Abraham and a chosen people is the basis of Old Testament Theology and that it may be called the foundation of the Christian Church. In this connection arises the question of continuity and discontinuity, and Eckardt asserts that for St. Paul discontinuity must be looked at from the standpoint of an essential continuity, i.e., of God's unbroken intention to save mankind. He observes moreover that Jews have a concern lest an ecumenism extended to them may be simply a disguised form of an attempt to convert them. Although the perspective of the book is ecumenical, in order to avoid ambiguity the writer prefers the adjective covenantal.

The author believes that Judaism lives in its own right as the contemporary of Christianity, but that our task is to make the tension between the two a creative one. He makes the observation that in Jesus Christ Judaism and all men are delivered from nationalism. The writer notes that in the Jewish-Christian encounter we have at times to set ourselves on the side of discontinuity and difference, but at other times on that of continuity and unity. Yet Eckardt maintains that by virtue of the Christian gospel the wall of division between Jew and gentile is destroyed once and for all and that the fact of continuity demands preeminent emphasis.

In the course of his presentation the author quotes many modern theologians and shows that he is conversant with theological trends. In the Appendix, however, he enters into a controversial area in his espousal of the cause of the modern state of Israel; it probably would have been better for the book if this section had been left out. The work closes with a good bibliography and an index of three pages.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

*Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, by I. Abrahams. Ktav Publishing House, New York, N.Y., 1968. Pp. First Series, xxxiv + 178; Second Series, x + 226. \$12.50.

This book which contains two separate series published originally in 1917, 1924, is a reprint and belongs to the *Library of Biblical Studies* edited by Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky. The author was a reader in Talmudic at the University of Cambridge after having been senior tutor at Jews' College, London. This volume, however, is updated in having an appropriate Prolegomenon by Dr. Morton S. Enslin, the well-known New Testament scholar, who is professor at Bryn Mawr College and editor of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. He makes the apt remark that some books are as useful decades after their first appearance as when they were originally published. In the Prolegomenon he observes that Abrahams and his fellow contenders rightly pointed out that Judaism was far from being the barren legalism that had been depicted by scholars both ignorant of, and indifferent to, the Hebrew and Aramaic writings which they neglected and distorted. Enslin notes that Abrahams was directly concerned with materials which parallel and illuminate aspects of, and utterances in, the Gospels.

Part I contains twenty-one chapters, while Part II has seventeen; each section is followed by two indexes: one of names and subjects and another of New Testament passages. In a review of this book it is not possible to mention all the subjects which are discussed, but the value of the work for the parish minister may be illustrated by references to items in various chapters. The synagogue is called the most gracious product of Jewish legalism, and Abrahams maintains that it was a Palestinian institution of the Persian period and gave form to communal worship which was adopted by Christianity and Islam. In this connection he observes that the Synoptics draw a pleasing picture of the freedom of teaching permitted by the synagogue. In the article on the greatest commandment the observation is made that the questioner desired an opinion as to whether Jesus did or did not share a prevalent view of reducing the Law to fundamental rules. The author notes that at the time when John the Baptist died the Law was only in its first stages of Rabbinical development. The article on Pharisaic baptism is helpful and worthy of study. In the chapter on widows' houses the writer says that it is a familiar fact that in all ages men are tempted to make undue use of their influence

over wealthy women in the cause of religious institutions. In connection with the cleansing of the Temple, Abrahams says that modern writers are too inclined to confuse Pharisaism with Puritanism, and he observes that the payment of the Temple-tax was a privilege as well as a burden. As regards the parables of Jesus the writer asserts that close comparison with the most similar of the Rabbinic material nearly always reveals dissimilarity amid the similarity. In regard to the Sabbath it seems to the writer that Jesus differed fundamentally from the Pharisees in that he asserted a general right to abrogate the regulation of the Sabbath for man's ordinary convenience, while the Rabbis limited the license to instances of danger to life. The minister will find much help on the chapters of God's forgiveness and man's forgiveness.

In connection with the discussion of the yoke Abrahams remarks that virtue and vice are both burdens, but that there is joy in the very weight of the yoke in the abundance of the service. In connection with the Good Samaritan the writer quotes the late Professor James A. Montgomery: "The gratitude of the Samaritan was made to point a moral to the Jews even as was the faith of a heathen centurion upon another occasion (Matt. 8:5-13)." The extensive chapter on the imitation of God contains much valuable information. The volume closes with a number of miscellaneous notes, among which is one (Luke 17:21): "The kingdom of God is within you." In this connection the author maintains: "It would be almost a sacrilege to lose so fine a phrase, even though as a translation it is clearly inadmissible." In this case the reader may compare the text and the marginal note of the Revised Standard Version.

These observations give some of the subjects treated in this book, and they indicate that the preacher can use this work to advantage by reading various chapters at different times; he may also end up by having a more favorable concept of the Pharisees than he had before.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

*Mark the Evangelist*, by Willi Marxsen (English translation). Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1969. Pp. 222. \$5.50.

Professor Marxsen is teaching New Testament in the University of Münster, Germany.



His book on Mark was published in Germany in 1956 and has been used on the Continent as a standard work on the new method of *Redaktionsgeschichte* (redaction history). That method is intended to supplement the deficiencies of Form Criticism as practiced by Bultmann, Dibelius, K. L. Schmidt *et al.* Marxsen starts from the hermeneutical principle that in order adequately to understand a literary work, it is necessary to treat it as an integral whole. For that purpose exegesis must move in two opposite directions, viz. from the total view of its structure, method and aim to the underlying smallest elements, and from the text in its successive development towards the discovery of the message of the complete text.

Professor Marxsen holds that in order to reach that goal it is not necessary to analyze every detail of the Gospel. He selects four themes which in his opinion are sufficiently central in Mark's Gospel to elucidate its nature and aim. Thus he offers four studies, viz. on John the Baptist, the geographical outline, the *Euangelion*, and Mark chapter 13. Mark's significance, he contends, lies in the fact that being confronted with a multitude of isolated and floating traditions, he conceived of the possibility and necessity to consolidate them into a homogeneous and consistent picture of the Risen Lord. Thus Christ appears both as proclaimer and as subject of the proclamation. Matthew and Luke adopted not only the Gospel pattern but also a good deal of the material found in Mark. But they would not only "improve" the picture by adding materials drawn from other sources, they would also give to the picture an entirely new perspective in order to meet the needs of their own situation. Matthew would introduce Jesus as the originator of the Church's teaching which the early community was anxious to preserve but also to re-interpret. Luke, in turn, would be anxious to depict the historical Jesus, who was held to be present in the Church as its dynamic, by which the gulf between earthly time and the Parousia would be bridged. Luke is the classical representative of *Heilsgeschichte* (Holy History).

Marxsen is anxious to show that historical criticism is unable to go back behind the work of the evangelists to Jesus himself. What we are able to grasp as historical reality in

the gospels is the *kerygma* as it was apprehended by the gospel writers themselves. In as much as Christ himself is at work in it, the *kerygma* is an objective reality. Yet to the historian it is given as a mental reality only. Marxsen offers an abundance of interesting and suggestive observations, as a result of which his book is a rich mine of suggestions for Gospel exegesis. Much of it, as the author himself constantly points out, is hypothetical as is to be expected of pioneer work in an entirely new field. Where I am absolutely unable to follow the author is in his tendency to whittle down the significance which the authority of Jesus had for origin and development of the *kerygma*. I heartily agree with the symbolical interpretation which, like E. Lohmeyer and Rudolf Grob, he applies to Mark's Gospel. Nevertheless, if the historicity of Jesus had been so irrelevant for early Christianity, as some times it appears in Dr. Marxsen's presentation, one wonders why the primitive community ever felt the need for having a Gospel in the Markan style rather than being satisfied with a mere collection of Logia similar to that found in the Gospel of Thomas. According to the author, the Church felt itself free to mold the *kerygma* according to the varying needs of the ages. In Marxsen's view the primitive church was onesidedly engaged in Christological ideas. The selection of the four studies of this book creates the impression that the early church was not interested in the saving work of Jesus.

Form Criticism has opened up a new avenue to the study of the gospels by teaching us that among other uses the Gospels may serve as sources for the history of their own age. In their beliefs they reflect the historical and social conditions in the church of their time. But in his selection of the four themes of his book, the author has proceeded in a onesided way. He neglects almost completely the materials, in which the tradition describes Jesus as the supreme benefactor of men. That procedure was almost inevitably bound to lead to a onesided and partial view of the spiritual history of the early community. With the renewed interest in and appreciation of Mark that is so obvious in these days, it is to be hoped that the gaps in Dr. Marxsen's picture will soon be filled up.

OTTO A. PIPER



*Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of William Childs Robinson*, ed. by J. McDowell Richards. John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1968. Pp. 160. \$5.00.

"As an exponent and a champion of the Reformed faith William Childs Robinson sought to sound again and again the vital affirmations of the Protestant Reformation. . . . Of one thing we can be sure. He will approve the title, for this represents the witness of his life." Thus J. McDowell Richards, editor of this volume and President of Columbia Theological Seminary where Professor Robinson taught for forty-one years, begins this tribute.

The essays are generally of a high quality, although the book suffers from the usual deficiencies of a *estschrift*. Oscar Cullmann's "The Relevance of Redemptive History" contains both a fine capsule of his stress on *Heilsgeschichte* and also an appraisal of the correct and false *aggiornamento Heilsgeschichte* should take in the theology of the Church. This article, along side of Joachim Jeremias' "Lampades in Matt. 25:1-13," and Bo Reicke's "Paul's Understanding of Righteousness," gives the book both international flavor and depth scholarship. Jeremias is always excellent when he is working with the parables, and Reicke has presented *justificatio* in a manner that "avoids the dilemma between a purely objective or a purely subjective conception of righteousness" (p. 49). "Jesus is Lord" by F. F. Bruce is basically a philological study of *kurios*, and George Eldon Ladd's, "Paul and the Law," places stress on the ethical aspect of the law rather than the ceremonial.

Professor Robinson's two sons, William and James, also contribute articles. William, Jr., an Associate Professor of New Testament at Perkins School of Theology, has a very interesting essay on "Word and Power" (I Cor. 1:17-2:5). James' article is entitled, "World in Modern Theology and in New Testament Theology." The argument is for theology to turn its emphasis from an understanding of existence toward a theology—and New Testament theology primarily—in terms of world. "The time may return when both can be cast primarily in terms of God (but for now) the new theology and New Testament theology

may well be cast primarily in terms of world" (p. 110).

The book appropriately closes with articles on "John Calvin's Polemic Against Idolatry," by John Leith, and "Theological Persuasion," by T. F. Torrance. Leith stresses Calvin's mighty polemic against idols could well be reemphasized today although the idols of the twentieth century differ from those of Calvin's day. Torrance's essay is essentially traditional. It closes the book with these remarks, "Yet this is certain, that theological persuasion cannot succeed without the subsidiary work of moving people to renounce themselves and leave their inappropriate way of thinking, although its primary work is to induce rational conviction and belief in . . . Jesus Christ (p. 136)." To this William Childs Robinson would certainly agree.

J. WILLIAM ALDRIDGE

*The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*, ed. by Gregory Dix (Reissued with corrections, preface, and bibliography by Henry Chadwick). S.P.C.K., London, 1968. Pp. lxxxii + 90. 50s.

The wave of reprints which incessantly overruns the reading public in this country and elsewhere occasionally washes ashore the reissue of a book which has not only the distinction of having been out of print for some years, but which the interested scholar or, for that matter, the interested pastor, has really missed in his private library. In this connection it is certainly good news for every student of early Christian history and of liturgy to learn that Dom Gregory Dix's study of the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* is available once again. This reviewer confesses, nevertheless, that his joy is mingled with renewed regret over the fact that this first installment, originally published in 1937, was never followed by the promised second volume which should have contained a full introduction and the much needed detailed analysis of the text.

It can be said without exaggeration that Hippolytus' treatise is "the most illuminating single source of evidence extant on the inner life and religious polity of the Early Christian

Church." Written about A.D. 215 by a rather conservative churchman in Rome as a polemical defense of traditional practices, it contains very ancient, perhaps the oldest, liturgical formularies known to us for such functions as the consecration of congregational officers, baptism, and the eucharistic service (including, e.g., the dialogical preface, "Lift up your hearts, etc."), and it touches on many questions of church life, such as fasting, catechumenate, private devotions, spiritual reading, and so forth.

The main problem with the treatise has been, and still is, a textual one. Except for scattered fragments and elaborate amplifications, the Greek original seems to be lost. All textual reconstruction is based on an incomplete Latin translation together with several more or less adulterated oriental versions. Even the identity of the treatise itself remained in the dark until recent decades. Known under the misleading title, "Egyptian Church Order," the work was definitely ascribed to Hippolytus by Connolly in 1916. In his book, Dix has tried to construct "what Hippolytus wrote," carefully weighing the entire textual evidence. He gives a running English translation at the top of his page and supplies the Latin and Greek evidence as well as other textual material (in English translation) in the apparatus and in footnotes. Admittedly, the arrangement is somewhat clumsy, and Dix's translation is less elegant than the smooth reconstruction by B. S. Easton which has also been reprinted (*The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, translated into English with Introduction and Notes, Archon Books, New York, 1962). But the advantages are obvious: the reader is directly confronted with the complexity of the textual problem and has the Latin and Greek fragments before him. Furthermore, Dix's masterly brief introduction is indispensable as one of the best treatments of the document in English. It presents the general consensus of modern scholarship stressing especially the conservative nature of Hippolytus' intentions and pointing forcefully to the Jewish background of the liturgical materials.

Henry Chadwick of Oxford, the editor of this new edition, brings the reader up to date in his thorough 16-page introduction. He reviews recent attempts at establishing a more reliable text, the debate about authorship, the question of the *anaphora*; he lists in a "select

bibliography" studies up to 1965; and he does not even forget to mention that Pope John XXIII ordered the famous statue of the saint which was probably executed during his lifetime, to be placed in the renovated Vatican Library. (Do not miss looking at it there next time you are in Rome!)

KARLFRIED FROELICH

*William Carstares and the Kirk by Law Established*, by A. Ian Dunlop. Saint Andrew Press, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1967. Pp. 189. \$4.20.

William Carstares was one of a distinguished line of ecclesiastical statesmen who have rendered signal service to the Church of Scotland ever since it became Protestant in 1560—a line which extends from John Knox in the 16th century to John White in the 20th century. Carstares (1649-1715) made his contribution mainly during the troubled period between the Revolution of 1688-89 and the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715. During those years he was the trusted and sagacious counselor of King William of Orange, who reigned as monarch of Great Britain from 1689 till his death in 1702; and as such he exerted such an influence in Scotland, particularly in Church affairs, that he was known as "Cardinal" Carstares.

Carstares's contribution may be summed up under three heads. First, due in no small measure to him, the Church of Scotland was established in 1690 on a permanently Presbyterian basis—a fairly tolerant and accommodating one, however—and during the subsequent years of William's reign it achieved a large measure of freedom from state control. For example, its General Assembly acquired the right to determine its own date and place of meeting, quite independent of royal desires. Again, the question of a Parliamentary incorporating union between England and Scotland was raised acutely during the opening years of the 18th century. The Church of Scotland ministers might have prevented this union if they had actively opposed it; but Carstares, more than anyone else, persuaded them to acquiesce in the union, which eventually took place in 1707. Third, as Principal of Edinburgh University from 1703 till his death—a position which, incidentally, he combined with a charge in

one of the city churches—Carstares was largely instrumental in transforming the small and ill-equipped college into something like an up-to-date University with specialized chairs, an augmented staff of reasonably well paid professors, and an increased student enrollment. "If James VI founded the college, the father of the university, and especially the Faculties of Divinity, Arts, Law, and perhaps Medicine, may be said to be Principal Carstares."

The standard biography of Carstares was written in 1874 by Robert H. Story, later Professor of Church History at Glasgow University, and eventually Principal of the University. Though Story's is an admirable book, there was reason, if not need, for a reappraisal of Carstares and his work. This has been done by The Reverend A. Ian Dunlop in the present volume, the substance of which was delivered as Chalmers Lectures in 1964. Mr. Dunlop has studied the primary sources as well as the secondary works on his subject. He has followed the plan of letting Carstares's actions speak for themselves. And he has thus presented a careful and well-documented study of a man whom Lord Macaulay described as "one of the most remarkable men of that age."

NORMAN V. HOPE

*George Bell, Bishop of Chichester*, by Ronald C. D. Jasper. Oxford University Press, 1967. Pp. 401. \$11.20.

In 1935 Dr. G.K.A. Bell published his massive and monumental biography of Randall Davidson, who had been Archbishop of Canterbury from 1903 to 1928. This book was acclaimed speedily as not only an outstanding study of the life of a great ecclesiastic, but also as a knowledgeable and perceptive contribution to the history of the Church of England during the first thirty years of the twentieth century.

Dr. Bell, the author, died in 1958; and now he has become himself the subject of a biography by Mr. R.C.D. Jasper. A fascinating and absorbing story it is, for Bell was a man of many interests and activities. He was the successful diocesan Bishop of Chichester from 1929 to 1958. In that capacity he carried out with efficiency and dispatch the official duties of his episcopate—ordaining clergy to

the ministry and confirming first communicants etc. He took particular interest also in Christian education, appointing a Bishop's Chaplain for schools to help improve the teaching of religion in his diocese; and he sought to raise the standard of clerical scholarly efficiency by appointing a Canon Teacher for the diocese, the first appointee being Reginald John Campbell, the famous former minister of London's City Temple. Bell was also deeply interested in the performing arts, especially in religious drama; and in 1930 he appointed E. Martin Browne as Director of Religious Drama for his diocese—the first appointment of its kind in Great Britain.

But Bell had many interests outside his diocese. For one thing, he was one of the pioneers in the Life and Work Movement which sought to draw the churches together in united social witness. After holding two conferences, at Stockholm, 1925, and Oxford, 1937, Life and Work voted to merge with the Faith and Order Movement to form the World Council of Churches in 1948, of which Bell became honorary President. A by-product of this ecumenical activity on Bell's part was his editing of four series of *Documents on Christian Unity*, between 1924 and 1958.

Again, Bell was deeply interested in Germany. He did his best to find a new home for some of the refugees—both Jewish and non-Jewish—who were forced out of Germany after Hitler became Chancellor in 1933 and the real drift of his policies became clear. When Hitler attempted to Nazify the German Protestant Churches, Bell ranged himself at once on the side of the opposition movement as represented by such men as Niemöller, Lilje, and Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer, in fact, became one of Bell's intimate friends; and just before he was executed in 1945, he gave a parting message for Bell to an English fellow prisoner in the Flossenbürg Camp where he was put to death.

Bell became a member of the House of Lords in 1937, and for the next twenty years he employed the gilded chamber as a forum in which to champion some unpopular causes. For example, in 1944 he protested against the obliteration bombing of German cities by the Royal Air Force—a protest which probably cost him the Archbishopric of Canterbury, when William Temple died in October of that year. Again, in 1948-49, Bell expressed doubts in the House of Lords about the



legality of the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals, which in his judgment raised serious issues not only of international law, but also of justice, humanity, and political wisdom.

Clearly, Bell was a man of unusual energy, of great courage, and of wide Christian and humanitarian interests. His story has been eloquently told by Mr. Jasper in a book which not only describes Bell and his work, but also reveals much about the Church of England of which he was so distinguished a servant.

NORMAN V. HOPE

*A Song of Ascents*, by E. Stanley Jones. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1968. Pp. 400. \$4.95.

In 1925 Dr. E. Stanley Jones published his book, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, which described in fresh and appealing terms the work of the Christian Mission in India. This book speedily became a best seller—a million copies of it were sold—and ever since then Dr. Jones has been an internationally-known Christian figure.

In his latest volume, *A Song of Ascents*, he has written what he calls "a spiritual autobiography." In it, naturally, he has something to say about his public life and work. He was born in 1884 in Baltimore, Maryland, was converted in a Methodist church there, and attended Asbury College in Kentucky to study for the Christian ministry. On graduation he was accepted by the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions for service in India, to which he sailed in 1907. After serving two pastorates in Lucknow and Sitapur he came to the conclusion that he had a special mission to the intellectuals of India, and was set apart by his Board for this special work. In carrying out this assignment he was responsible for some significant new agencies and methods of Christian work and witness. For example, in 1930 he started Christian Ashrams at Sat Tal and Lucknow, where small groups of Christians could come together for stated periods of time in order to live under corporate discipline and thus deepen their spiritual lives. Again, he inaugurated what he called Round Table Conferences, at which Christians and non-Christians could engage in dialogue with one another. And he found-

ed the Christian Psychiatric Center at Lucknow, the first of its kind in India, for the purpose of treating upset missionaries on the field instead of sending them back home to be taken care of.

Most recently Dr. Jones has spent six months of each year doing the work of an evangelist in the United States, and the other six months in the rest of the world, mostly in the East, and particularly in India, evangelizing and conducting Ashrams.

Dr. Jones has not been forgotten by the Methodist Church in America. In 1924 he was nominated for the episcopate, but withdrew his name. In 1928 he was actually elected bishop, but resigned after one day, deciding that his calling as a Christian minister lay not in administration but in evangelistic and missionary work.

Dr. Jones has shown a Christian concern for the solution of some of the most important public problems of the world and the church. For example, in 1941 he tried hard to avert the threatened conflict between the United States and Japan; but Pearl Harbor reduced his well-meant efforts to naught. Again, he sought to mediate between India and Pakistan in order to avoid the partition of the Indian subcontinent after it achieved its independence from Britain in 1947, but again his endeavors were not successful. Once more, he proposed a plan of federal union among the churches of the U.S.A. according to which "under the Church of Jesus Christ in America there would be branches, no longer churches, separate and sovereign, but branches of the one church"—for example the Lutheran branch of the Church of Jesus Christ in America, the Episcopal branch, the Baptist branch, etc. "Within these churches there could be local self-government, states' rights, and provincial autonomy. Over these branches there would be a General Assembly of the Church of Jesus Christ in America made up of representatives from all of the branches. This General Assembly would be the sovereign body, having responsibility for everything that concerned the church as a whole—for example, a strategy and program for evangelism, for missions, and for education (pp. 274-5). But this plan did not receive much serious consideration among the major denominations of the United States; and no attempt was made to implement it.

The major theme of Dr. Jones's book, how-



ever, has to do not so much with these outward events and happenings—interesting though they are—but rather with the author's inner experiences and the lessons he has learned concerning the spiritual life. For example, he believes wholeheartedly in individual personal decision for Jesus Christ as Savior. He is profoundly convinced that Jesus Christ is the Lord of all good life, and that his way of life represents realism, since it is the only way which will work fruitfully and happily. To be converted and committed to Jesus Christ is to be enrolled in membership of the Kingdom of God, God's new order of things. And this Kingdom embraces and controls not only individuals in their personal lives, but also social and group relationships—for example, among different races and classes and nations. And this kind of discipleship, Dr. Jones is convinced, can be maintained in full vitality and richness only by a disciplined life of prayer and devotion.

Despite the fact that this book tends at times to be somewhat repetitious, it tells a story which should be of the deepest interest to all who are concerned for the advance of the cause of Jesus Christ in the world.

NORMAN V. HOPE

*The Reformation in Germany*, by Joseph Lortz (Trans. by R. Walls). Darton, Longmans and Todd, London; Herder and Herder, New York, N.Y., 1968. Vol. I, pp. viii + 488; Vol. II, pp. 348. \$22.50.

The publication of this work in English tongue is probably even more of an ecclesiastical event than a scholarly. Originally published in German a full thirty years ago, it has in that form played an unrivalled role in Roman Catholic historical thought ever since. For the first time, on a commanding scale, Lortz brought Roman Catholic discussion of the Reformation out of the category of a prosecutor's brief to genuine history. He documented the desperate need for reform and viewed Luther himself, not as moral pervert or psychopath, but essentially as a religious and theological figure of major stature, even while still, unfortunately, a radical subjectivist. This history has been in the background of the radical change in

Roman Catholic-Protestant relations in the last few years. To define the scope of its influence would take many pages and much more learning than this reviewer commands, for it would traverse the whole sweep of a generation of historical and ecumenical thought. To have Lortz in English will bring it within the reach of seminarian and priest and teaching nun in the United States, where ecumenical historical perspectives are generally less sophisticated than in Europe. It should also make the Roman Catholic case more persuasive to Protestants.

J. H. NICHOLS

*The French Enlightenment and the Jews*, by Arthur Hertzberg. Columbia University Press, New York and London. The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, Penna., 1968. Pp. 420. \$12.50.

This learned and provocative book offers much to Christians, who like this reviewer, may lack the background in Jewish history to appraise confidently its contribution in that context.

The two-fold focus involves an interpretation of the emancipation of the Jews as a dimension of the secularization of the French Revolution, and an examination of the roots of the anti-semitism which has since manifested itself in the post-Christian secular society. Both themes illuminate the much discussed ending of the Constantinian era and the nature of the "secular" world which has succeeded it.

The bulk of Dr. Hertzberg's study is a lucid, many-sided description of the position of the Jews in the France of the Old Regime. All the Jews had been expelled from France in 1394, but they made their way back, first as *marranos*, and then openly as Jews from the time of Louis XIV. There were three main groupings, the Sephardic Jews of Bordeaux and Bayonne, the Jews from the Papal States, radiating out of Avignon, and the bearded Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazim of the Alsace region. The divergent economic and cultural activities and legal status in each area are analyzed, offering occasion for comparisons with the tensions within the Huguenot community of the same period.

The acts of emancipation in 1790 and 1791 would not have been enacted without the Enlightenment, and most Christian leaders opposed them. But the battle in the National Assembly was led by the Abbé Grégoire, whose Jansenist millenarianism required the conversion of the Jews, and the strongest voice to the contrary was that of the Jacobin Rewbell. And a major wing of the enlightened philosophers, Voltaire and the Physiocrats, opposed the emancipation for their post-, or rather pre-Christian reasons. By reviving ancient pagan anti-semitism, and Cicero especially, Voltaire became the fountain-head of modern secular anti-semitism. Diderot and d'Holbach were in the same camp, while Mirabeau rather appealed to Montesquieu in urging emancipation. As the American Declaration of Independence tacitly excluded Negroes, so the Declaration of the Rights of Man left out the Jews in France. The emancipation was finally carried out on the grounds of logical consistency, not on the merits of the Jewish question itself. And the anti-semitism of more recent generations cannot be entirely explained by Christian influence over a time-lag; secularism has its independent sources for anti-semitism, dating back before the emancipation to the Enlightenment and Voltaire.

J. H. NICHOLS

*The Manipulator and the Church*, by Maxie D. Dunham, Gary J. Herbertson, and Everett L. Shostrom. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1968. Pp. 76. \$3.50.

Two pastors and a psychologist who is Director of the Institute of Therapeutic Psychology, Santa Ana, California, are issuing a "Call to Christian Actualization." They deal with man's plight as a manipulator who is characterized by "deception, unawareness, control, and cynicism." Christian actualization is "a commitment to a style of life that purposely seeks to actualize one's true self, rather than succumb to the phony roles of the manipulator." The actualizing person is honest, aware, free, and trusting. The trip from manipulation to actualization is taken with a small group led jointly by a minister and a psychologist. If you cannot get hold of a psychologist you may send a prospective

leader to a sensitivity training course. Before you do, it might be well to read John Fry's "A Hard Look At Adult Education."

ARTHUR M. ADAMS

*Ministry and Management, The Study of Ecclesiastical Administration*, by Peter F. Rudge. Tavistock Publications, London, 1968. (Distributed in the U.S.A. by Barnes & Noble, New York City.) Pp. 191. 36s.

The author, who now works as a church management consultant in Britain, did graduate study in public administration before serving ten years as an Anglican priest in his native Australia. The doctoral studies at the University of Leeds and consultations in America laid the foundations for this volume.

Following a brief survey of the field in England and North America, the author presents five typologies of administrative theory: (1) traditional (or patrimonial), (2) charismatic (or intuitive), (3) classical (or bureaucratic), (4) human relations (or democratic), and (5) systematic (or organic). Each is examined in terms of its mode of organization, decision-making process, concept of leadership, and control process. Then each is evaluated in the light of the Christian doctrines of (1) the Church, (2) Church and Society, (3) Ministry, (4) the purpose of the Church, (5) the Doctrine of God, and (6) the Doctrine of Man. Dr. Rudge concludes "the systemic way of thinking has the greatest weight of biblical support and is nearest to the central stream of Christian thinking; and so the systemic theory of management is supremely suitable for use in the church."

The second half of the book deals with the practice of ecclesiastical administration in England. Detailed illustrations of each of the five approaches are followed by observations on problems emerging from operations involving mixed types, and demonstrations of the superiority of the systemic theory in meeting issues like change, financial management, building policy, and personnel management.

We must all be grateful for the prodigious effort which has focused modern thinking about administration in the five typologies

but it is important to notice that while each of these is a consistent way of summarizing an attitude, their true relation to each other in the history of administration studies is rather like that of the successive layers of paint in an unfinished work of art in which each layer adds new clarity about the subject but by no means blocks out all that has been achieved in previous efforts. Under these circumstances, theological evaluation of the separate models is somewhat less useful than simply weighing against theological and practical norms each process which can be identified and described. Furthermore, one is not under these circumstances tempted to ignore or denigrate in practice useful ways of doing things which were discovered early, but because of the limits of our knowledge seem incongruous in a particular overall model.

Despite this rather extensive reservation, I believe this volume should be of interest to most ministers and is required reading for those studying church administration.

ARTHUR M. ADAMS

*The Black Messiah*, by Albert B. Cleage, Jr. Sheed and Ward, New York, N.Y., 1968. Pp. 278. \$6.50.

Assuredly there is a pressing need for a theology originating within the black Christian Community. Too long theology has been under the dominance of the white man. One of the dilemmas of theology today is that it has grown soft under the protection of a western "Christian" civilization. Most certainly Jesus was neither white nor WASP, although western culture has more often than not pictured him in this way. Yet one can validly question the author's forceful and dynamic attempt at a reconstruction of both theology and the historical Jesus. The author has relegated Paul to a doubtful role in Christianity, just as the white church, by and large, did during the latter part of the nineteenth and the early twentieth century. But it is the rediscovery of the forcefulness of the Pauline concept of reconciliation that has given much of the positive thrust to both theology and the Church to accomplish what has been achieved in the past few years. Too little, too late? Yes. Yet without Paul the universality and the inclusiveness of the Gospel become distorted.

The author is correct in refuting the heresy of a white Messiah, but Jesus was a Jew and can be termed black only in the sense that he is likewise genetically the member of an often persecuted and despised race. Jesus was not a Zealot as the author rightly maintains (p. 4). Had he been so he would not have been betrayed by Judas who probably was. That Jesus came to establish a community that is revolutionary because of its calling is generally agreed. But the author could have done both theology and his people a service had he correlated the sufferings of both Israel and Jesus more closely to the unjust sufferings of the black man.

The power, relevance, and dynamic nature of the sermons should give every minister a glimpse of the power of preaching in a day when preaching is under attack. Many, both black and white, will disagree with this "strong and uncompromising presentation" of Black Power, but to neglect these sermons would be an error. The sermons give also the historical roots of black protest and help to illuminate the tragedy of Detroit (and America). Moreover, the judgment upon the white church is clear in these chapters. It is unfortunate that there is no word of reconciliation to balance the account.

J. WILLIAM ALDRIDGE

*Asian Psychology*, by Gardner Murphy and Lois B. Murphy. Basic Books, New York, N.Y., 1968. Pp. 238. \$7.50.

Except in the sense of the laboratory experiment, psychology was not born in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. Man's attempts to understand himself have been present in every civilization and region from the dawn of history. Most of these efforts have not neatly separated themselves as "psychology" from the context of religion, philosophy, and morals in which they arose. Therefore, modern western scholars, attempting to develop psychology as a scientific enterprise, have generally paid little attention to them. This is to the impoverishment of psychology as a discipline of cultural understanding.

It is plain that the Murphys see no contradiction in being concerned about psychology both in this sense and as a rigorous modern scientific discipline. Both are renowned for their researches, Gardner Murphy on many



subjects, and Lois Murphy on the study of children. The present volume is the first of a series that will explore the psychologies of various cultures and regions. Their concern is to study the basic uniformities that exist beneath different concepts and languages, as well as to set forth actual differences.

They note that their study is "highly selective" and does not profess to be a comprehensive survey. Without such self-limitations, of course no book of this kind could be written.

More than half the volume is devoted to the psychology of India, with many quotations from the sacred writings, and with interpretative comments by modern scholars of both East and West. More briefly, China and Japan are also treated in similar fashion. Throughout, the Murphys present their own running commentary, which is the most interesting aspect of the book. Happily, they are not afraid to do a bit of speculating about the relation of geography and history to the kinds of views of man that were developed through the Far East. With some qualifications especially for China, they are prepared to see the psychology of the Far East as more pessimistic than that in the West.

It is of course impossible to quote from the sacred writings of the East and omit reference to ontological, epistemological, religious, and ethical materials. What the Murphys have done is to focus on the "man material" without ignoring the context in which it is to be found. This makes the book very much like a "doctrine of man" study of selected areas in Asia. With the rising interest in theological anthropology in this country, I should not be surprised if it were read by more theologians than psychologists.

Although this book stands on its own feet and is not technically part of a series, the Murphys hope to produce volumes about Greece and Rome, and about other periods and regions. We shall eagerly anticipate such books, especially since they are so written as to require of the reader only a general knowledge of the region and not a technical background.

SEWARD HILTNER

*Referral in Pastoral Counseling*, by William B. Oglesby. Prentice-Hall, Inc.,

Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968. Pp. 139. \$3.95.

This volume in the Successful Pastoral Counseling series, being produced by Prentice Hall under the general editorship of the late Russell Dicks, meets a long standing need in the field of pastoral care for a treatment of the important topic or referral. Referral is a deceptively simple process at first glance. One has merely to pick up the telephone or tell the parishioner to go and see Dr. Blank, doesn't one? All ministers with any experience know the inadequacy of this view, and many have wished for a competent guide to the complexities of the referral process. In fact it is not too much to say that a thorough knowledge of indications for referral and of referral procedures are among the most important pastoral care tools that a parish minister can possess.

Oglesby has provided such a sound guide. This is a practical book in the best sense of the word, with chapters devoted to When to Refer, How to Refer, Where to Refer, Special Problems in Referral, and The Ongoing Ministry. The author is an experienced pastor and teacher. His mature wisdom in the field of pastoral care and counseling comes through on almost every page.

There are two points about which I have questions in his treatment. The first is his decision not to attempt to offer criteria for referral in terms of what is happening with the parishioner. He points to the great difficulties in establishing such criteria, and to the absence of any generally accepted standards of human functioning which might aid him. The problem is further complicated by the difficulty of assessing the interpersonal liabilities and assets of the situation in which the person is living. I believe that, as difficult as this question is, some guidelines can be established. I have found the view of human functioning described in *The Vital Balance* by Karl Menninger, *et al.*, useful in discussing the question of referral with seminarians. In Menninger's terms it seems clear that persons functioning at levels below that of the first order of dysfunction are candidates for referral in most instances.

A second, less important, difference between this reviewer's position and Oglesby's is his separation of the skill of the minister from



his emotional security. The two go hand in hand in pastoral care, as Oglesby well knows and makes clear in his discussion. Hence his separation of these at the theoretical level (together with the question of time they constitute three criteria for referral in terms of the minister's capability) is hard to understand. Nevertheless his general emphasis on the minister rather than the parishioner is sound and helpful.

Despite these two reservations I strongly recommend this volume to ministers perplexed about referral—and to those who are not perplexed but who suspect that their referral ministry could profit from re-examination.

JAMES N. LAPSLEY

*Violent Sleep*, by Richard Luecke. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Penna., 1968. Pp. 139. \$1.95 (paper).

This is Volume IX in the stimulating and useful series, "The Preacher's Paperback Library," under the guidance of Edmund A. Steimle as Consulting Editor. The aim and hope of this series is "that it will contribute to the renewal of the preaching ministry." There is no intention of providing merely canned sermons or homiletical gimmicks, but an honest attempt "to hold in balance the emphasis which contemporary theologians and biblical scholars lay upon the centrality of proclamation and the very practical concerns of theological students and parish pastors who are engaged in the demanding task of preparing sermons of biblical and theological depth which also speak to the contemporary world" (p. vii).

Here are ten sermonic studies by Richard Luecke, the Director of Studies of the Urban Training Center for Christian Mission in Chicago. His earlier volume, *New Meanings for New Beings* (Fortress, 1964), established Dr. Luecke as one of the most original and perceptive minds of the contemporary American pulpit. The chapters in *Violent Sleep* are grouped under three headings: Jonah and Nineveh; Of Sleep and the City; The Temptations of Jesus: Of Seductions Old and New; and Holy Week: Of Wakings. The three studies of Jonah's experiences show how analogous they are to the challenges of the ferment facing us in the modern city and how

very much like Nineveh, we continue to live "with naïve assumptions." Four chapters on Jesus' temptation are a fresh handling of an over-worked passage of Scripture. Here is clear thinking and unusually relevant lessons brought into sharp focus with events and trends of our own time. However, at this point, some scholars might assert that the tendency to deal with these temptations as three separate entities is less appropriate than the interpretation of them as three facets of one temptation of power. Part III consists of three Holy Week studies of events associated with the Upper Room, the trial, and resurrection of Christ.

Preachers will find these studies to be among the most stimulating expositions and germinal discussions obtainable on these themes.

DONALD MACLEOD

*Sermons for Today*—No. 1: In The Red, by John H. Withers. No. 2: The Way of Acceptance, by Gordon E. Harris. No. 3: Is There A Word from the Lord?, by John Banks. Epworth Press, London E.C. 1, 1968. Pp. 128, 123, and 130. 8s 6d (each).

In these days when the publication of a book of sermons is a rarity, the Epworth Press is to be commended upon bringing out a series of paperbacks that feature the preaching of leading contemporary pulpit figures in Great Britain. The quality of these initial volumes augurs well for future numbers in the series and for the inspiration and usefulness these sermons can provide.

Those who know the pulpit reputation of John H. Withers from his earlier books of sermons, *An Arrow into the Air* (James Clarke, 1955) and *Speak for Yourself* (1958), will appreciate these new examples of his pulpit competence. Minister of the Fisherwick Church, Belfast, since 1946 and Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland for the year 1968-69, Dr. Withers has been involved in national radio and television programs, and as a member of the Board of Religious Advisers of the Independent Television Authority in London, has been concerned with the problems of communicating the Gospel to secular society. Here are eighteen sermons,

entitled *In The Red*, in the textual-topical tradition with intriguing subjects and marked by wide and varied reading in classic and contemporary literature. What is equally significant is Dr. Withers' ability to direct the essence of the Gospel message to the needs and strains of our human nature and invariably in a telling sentence disclose the excitement of Christian living.

The second volume, *The Way of Acceptance*, consists of twenty-one sermons by Gordon Harris, a younger minister of the Presbyterian Church of England, and author of *A Ministry Renewed* (SCM, 1968), a serious study of the plight and promise of the contemporary ministry in the Church of our time. In the Foreword to this book of sermons, Kenneth Slack, minister of London's City Temple, comments: "Mr. Harris has wrestled with the Bible and with himself. . . . He has grappled with the thinking of the theologians most deeply engaged in discerning the meaning of the Gospel for the contemporary world and shown its relevance with deceptive simplicity." His method, as Harris indicates in his Preface, is to focus upon the Gospel narratives and attempt "in each case to feel my way by empathy into each situation." The result is a series of creative chapters in a quick conversational style and with flashes of insight into the real message Jesus had intended. Mr. Harris thinks and speaks in the idiom of our times. He knows and is interested in people. The Gospel overtones in his sermons are strong.

As minister of Brunswick Methodist Church, Leeds, John Banks has had several distinguished predecessors, including Leslie Weatherhead and W. E. Sangster. In his Foreword to these twenty-two sermons, Dr. Weatherhead says of Banks' preaching that "his spiritual sensitivity makes every message relevant to modern need" and of his achievements that "he has won for himself the ability to help others from those divine resources which have made him what he is." Jeremiah's phrase, "Is There Any Word from the Lord?," supplies the title for this volume; each sermon confirms the positive answer, for the preacher's confident faith gives to his messages a vigorous thrust and a contagious spirit of victory.

The editors of the Epworth Press deserve enthusiastic commendation, not only for launching this series when most publishers

shrink from putting sermons into print, but particularly for their selection of three diverse preachers who are not afraid to eschew the moral essay and prefer to fashion a pulpit witness that echoes and reflects the message of the New Testament.

DONALD MACLEOD

*The Preacher's Heritage, Task, and Resources*, by Ralph G. Turnbull. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1968. Pp. 178. \$2.95 (paper).

This volume comprises a great deal of material arranged and condensed into limited compass. Its twelve chapters consist of lectures on preaching delivered in seminaries and before ministerial groups throughout the United States and Canada. The author, Dr. Turnbull, is presently the minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington; he served formerly as Professor of Homiletics at Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. The material is divided into three main parts: Preaching and Our Society and Culture; The Preacher's Task in the Contemporary World; and The Preacher's Resources. Each section represents a very great deal of survey reading and an attempt by the author to weave a tapestry of historical threads and colors without producing a spotty result.

The most useful section of the book is Part I where Dr. Turnbull delineates and assesses four major factors that have influenced the history of American preaching. Beginning with New England and the Puritans, he carries the story through the evangelical and liberal periods and then, in a rather full and historically factual chapter, he discusses many of the political, educational, and sociological cross-currents that have influenced the message and theology of the pulpit. Part II consists of almost thirty pages of discussion of the aims, difficulties, and opportunities of the preacher's vocation. Here the author is least effective because in covering much old ground he adopts the role of moralizer in the tedious vein of "we should" and "we must." Part III is an ambitious survey of the minister's resources, but intermittently the thread is lost through departures from the main purpose of this section in order to bring in other matters such as homiletical instruction

and analyses of the contemporary state of the American way of life.

Teachers of preaching will find this book useful for reference and its research dependable. Younger preachers may be scared off by the author's tendency to over-use superlatives (why are so many pulpit men referred to as "giants" or "eminent"?) and to continue to employ phrases now considered somewhat archaic ("pastored," "divine bestowal," "the sacred desk," "fresh anointing," for example). Nevertheless, Dr. Turnbull is above blame in his choice of perspective and in organizing clearly what he sees to have been right and wrong with our pulpit witness in the new world.

DONALD MACLEOD

*Profession: Minister*, by James D. Glasse. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1968. Pp. 174. \$3.75.

"The last thing the ministry needs is another professional society, complete, no doubt, with a new journal bearing one of those typically pompous titles: *Journal of the American Academy of Parish Clergy*." Such may be the reader's reaction, as it was the reviewer's, to James Glasse's proposal in *Profession: Minister*; yet if the reader casts his lot primarily with the parish clergy, his mind may change as he reads on, pondering his own predicament.

Based upon an analysis of the identity crisis in which the parish clergy finds itself—according to virtually every contemporary commentator at least—Glasse concludes that the "parish clergy must organize into an association or academy, develop programs of in-parish training to define and refine their special ministry, and pursue research to further the achievement of excellence in the parish ministry."

One of the primary purposes of such an Academy would be continuing education; however, *nota bene*, continuing education not of the variety currently practiced by certain of the seminaries. The author is quite perceptive in his observation that "many seminary programs require the pastor to revert to the role of student and sit at the feet of the professors again. The better programs are designed to encourage independent study, but even these require the pastor to return to the

seminary campus, live in a dormitory, read in the library, attend classes, and otherwise regress to the passive role of seminary student. As long as clergy play this game, their identity as professionals will remain confused."

Rather than perpetuating the umbilical cord, an Academy such as Glasse proposes would force the parish minister to reflect upon his profession as a professional; and then it would afford him the voice he needs to speak his own authoritative word to the seminaries. (Seminary curriculum committees are now quick to listen to student complaints and recommendations, but how many of them hold "hearings" at which time the *parish minister* communicates his insights into seminary education vis-à-vis professional demands?)

So, too, could such an Academy of Parish Clergy talk back to the denominational bureaucrats. Glasse is convincing when he argues that the "parish clergy have an opportunity to effect 'the system' if they can find their voices and have something to say."

According to the author, the primary purpose of his book is "to show that the minister has a place, that his work is in the world as a secular occupation"—in short, that the minister is a "professional." This means that the minister is "an educated man . . . an expert man . . . an institutional man . . . a responsible man . . . and a dedicated man." Unfortunately it must be said that the development of this argument is neither detailed nor convincing in all respects. It is too general; it relies too heavily upon studies by Carr-Saunders and Wilson and Samuel Blizard; and it often takes the medical profession as a norm to be imitated, in spite of the author's insistence that he is not doing that. A clear understanding of the minister as a professional is imperative, and of that the reader of this volume will be convinced. He may, however, find that he is even more confused as to precisely what "professional" means.

In spite of all that, Glasse raises questions worth asking, and offers to correspond with anyone interested in joining the American Academy of Parish Clergy. (Write to: Professor James D. Glasse, The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.)

JACK M. MAXWELL



*Sing of Life and Faith*, by Max Miller & Louise C. Drew. Pilgrim Press, Philadelphia and Boston, 1969. Pp. x + 165. \$4.50.

*Sing of Life and Faith* is a hymnal produced by the United Church of Christ; it contains all of the hymns and songs designated in that denomination's curriculum for Grades 1-6. Since it also contains an equal number of additional hymns, it is more than a curriculum piece, however, and should be of interest to all who work with youth. Perhaps the most unfortunate thing about the book is its very designation as "a children's hymnal." Many of the hymns in it are at least as suitable for teen-agers as for children and one wonders that even sixth graders could sing some of the hymns at all.

(One of the problems in reviewing this hymnal is that one does not know whether to assign praise and blame to the editors or to the curriculum committee, as there is no indication as to which half of the contents is the "given" and which half was added as supplementary.)

The contents of the hymnal are an interesting blend of traditional, churchly hymns and contemporary songs of social comment. Thus one discovers both "The Day of Resurrection" by John of Damascus and "If I Had a Hammer" by Lee Hayes and Pete Seeger. The theme song of the Reformation—"A Mighty Fortress"—is found along with the theme song of the civil rights movement—"We Shall Overcome." In addition to the usual German chorale tunes one discovers interesting tunes from Africa, Poland, Latvia, China and the Soviet Union. It is refreshing to break away from uniformly Western music (though this may give members of the Radical Right apoplexy—the more so since the dust jacket is red-orange).

The basic arrangement of the book follows the progression of the Statement of Faith of the United Church of Christ: the sections are entitled "God Creates," "God Seeks and Judges," "God Comes in Jesus Christ" (this section is subdivided into advent, birth, life and ministry, triumphal entry, passion, and resurrection), "God Gives His Spirit," "God Calls Us into Discipleship," "God Promises His Presence," and "Let Us

Praise God." Apparently some attempt was made to arrange hymns within the sections alphabetically according to the first lines of the texts; but just when this potentially happy principle is discovered, sufficient exceptions appear to make the whole scheme frustrating. (Who would look for "This Is the Charge I Keep" between "In All our Daily Duties" and "Let All Men Living" instead of after "This Is My Song"?).

In addition to supplying a number of texts and tunes not readily available in church publications, the hymnal occasionally attempts to adapt classical works to new uses. Thus Mozart's familiar "Alleluia" theme is easily made into a round. But transforming a longer, less memorable theme from G. P. Telemann into a round is far more difficult and one doubts that any average group of children could bring it off. And the attempt to make César Franck's theme from *Psalm CL* into a hymn tune of eight bars is totally unsatisfying, even though it is singable.

This volume excludes those pietistic ditties which have sometimes plagued church schools in the past. There are still a number of nature hymns which tend towards pantheism, but this failing is neither unique to children's hymnals nor to the popular theology of creation in general. The social concern of our generation is in great evidence; at one or two points its hymnodic expression is unsatisfactory. A contemporary composition (1967) by Alan Luff attempts to relate the miracle of the loaves and fishes to present problems of affluence and poverty. In terms of social ethics the aim is most admirable. In terms of exegesis the methodology is questionable. In terms of literary quality the result is almost distressing:

"Where can we find bread to feed these people?" said Jesus to Philip as the great crowd grew.

"Where can we find bread to feed these people?" says Jesus to his church as the crowd still grows.

"Here is a boy who has loaves and fishes," said Andrew to Jesus, "but what is that for these?"

There are men in the West who have food and riches, but how can that help the great hungry "two-thirds"?



"Make them all sit down," said Jesus sharing, "Collect what is over so that nothing is lost,"

Make nations that have share their knowledge and technology, give money and yourself to help your brothers' need.

(No. 97)

While the vast majority of hymns are written out with piano accompaniment, a few provide only a melody line and chord symbols. This reflects the increasing popularity of folk tunes and of instruments such as the guitar. A more versatile use of the hymnal would be possible, however, if piano accompaniments were written out for all hymns and songs, and if chord symbols were included even for more "traditional" tunes.

For all of that, this is a most helpful book. Its large size (8" x 10¼") allows music and text to be very readable. *Sing of Life and Faith* will be particularly valuable within the United Church of Christ. Each child may own a hymnal which he can use over a period of years, which he can take home for family use, and which will give him an appreciation of the hymnody of the whole church as well as of hymns for his own specific needs. The price (\$4.50) will probably prevent church schools of other denominations from buying in quantity books not geared to their own curriculum needs. But this hymnal can be an important resource for all who work with children and youth—teachers, counsellors, pastors, camp and program directors. Families of all denominations can be encouraged to purchase the book for home use.

It is to be hoped that some of the hymns in this volume will find their way into the hymnals of the adult church in future years. One may also hope that soon ecumenical curriculum planning will allow the publication of a single book which will provide a common hymnody for a number of denominations.

LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

*Words, Music, and the Church*, by Erik Routley. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1968. Pp. 224. \$4.95.

The title of this book is less suggestive of the subject under discussion than the subtitle

given on the dust jacket: "The Drama of Worship in a Changing Society." Within this frame of reference the author considers the significance of words and music in the contemporary life of the church. The book is of general interest because of its subject and the relationship of that subject to much which is going on in "experimental worship" currently; but this volume will be of particular interest to the reader of this journal because it represents the published form of the 1966 Stone Lectures at Princeton Seminary.

Erik Routley is a Fellow of the Royal School of Church Music and a British Congregationalist pastor. He is thus both a theoretician and a practitioner. The very form of his book reflects this. The first three major divisions ["Vanishing Orthodoxies," "Problems of Authority," and "Assaults on Conformity"] deal largely with specifically theoretical and historical concerns; the last two divisions ["The Dimension of Drama" and "Church Music Transformed"] discuss the role and function of music in the church's worship. Organists and choirmasters who suppose worship to be the concern of the pastor alone may be tempted to put the book aside at the end of the third division. Pastors, especially those with little musical background, may give up on the first sections and jump to the fourth and fifth divisions. Therefore it should be clearly stated that this is a book for *both* musicians and clergymen and *both* groups should read the *entire volume*.

For Routley, worship is drama and his book cannot be understood apart from this. The difficulty in reading this work is that "drama" is apt to be narrowly conceived by the reader in objectionable terms of playacting or histrionics. The author warns us that he does not mean this, but perhaps his warning comes a bit too late in the discussion. The reader will want to look carefully at Routley's definition of liturgical drama (p. 173ff) and then possibly reread previous sections of the book in the light of that definition.

The author argues that worship is not merely an experience, nor merely instruction, nor merely an appeal to the will, but a fusion of all three. As a background for the explication of worship as this kind of drama, Routley applies to music the three categories Tillich saw as components of faith: emotion, knowledge, and will. These are paralleled in

the phases of church music which Routley calls "romantic," "neo-orthodox," and "modern." His transference of theological terms to music is intriguing. He even speaks of a musical fundamentalism—a slavish obedience to the written text—and the problems this creates in the practical relationships between organist, choir, pastor, and congregation. (Any clergyman who considers the choir to be the "War Department of the Church" will appreciate the insights Routley provides here.)

The discussion of the legitimacy and place of jazz, pop, and folk music in worship will be of interest to all who are aware of current developments in liturgical practice. Routley has misgivings about the first two media mentioned, but heartily commends the third as serving a specific function:

What folk songs can do—as jazz and pop at present cannot—is reflect faithfully and precisely the prevailing mood of a culture. They can express the world's unregenerate needs, often through irony and anger; they can say things, sung by a soloist, that hymns cannot, communally sung, begin to say. It is in respect of folk song alone of these three alien forms that I myself am prepared to say, "If public worship as we know it cannot accommodate this, then we ought to consider altering public worship so that it can" (p. 125).

Those who think of worship in terms of a "psychological" progression of human experience (albeit through the use of Isaiah 6:1-8 as a paradigm: adoration, confession, assurance, instruction, dedication) will want to look carefully, but critically at Routley's alternate suggestion

that any service of worship is a drama whose "script" has at least some recognizable connection with the pilgrimage of mankind—and the corresponding pilgrimage of the individual—from the Old Testament to the New (p. 183).

These two patterns of worship are not mutually exclusive, particularly if one sees the holiness and righteousness of God together with man's sinfulness as Old Testament emphases, and forgiveness, instruction, and call to commitment as primary concerns of the New Testament. But there are questions

about Routley's approach to the use of the Old Testament. He defends the use of "Old Testament elements" and Psalms in Christian worship; his aim is noble though one wonders where his opponents (who supposedly want only "New Testament worship") are. Routley suggests that Old Testament elements are the "first mile" which must be travelled before we can go the "second mile" of the New Testament; this defense appears more self-defeating than convincing as it still seems to equate pre-Christian with sub-Christian. The author says that when the worshipper sings a Psalm in church he is not expressing personal belief but giving the Old Testament a dramatic place "on the same level as reading an extract from the newspaper in church" (p. 189). The suggestion leaves this reviewer mystified—and the more so after having heard some newspaper items read "liturgically" with little positive effect.

The Old Testament indeed has a place in Christian worship, but surely a more significant place than Routley accords it. May not even the most vindictive Psalm be more than a "newspaper" account of how men once (i.e., before Christ) felt? May it not be a genuine acknowledgement of how we often feel today, a more personal admission than many of our recited, formal prayers of confession?

One of the difficulties in this book for the American reader is that many of the illustrations are from British liturgical practice with which we may be far less familiar than the author. This is not an insurmountable barrier, however, particularly for anyone who will trouble himself to look up hymn texts and other elements he may not readily recognize. One other weakness in the book is in the discussion of the Eucharist. Routley's treatment seems thinner here and less satisfying than many other parts of his volume. A fuller consideration would be appreciated, particularly in the light of ecumenical interest in this aspect of worship and the primacy given to it by many liturgists.

Routley's insistence on a flexible interpretation of music and flexible form in worship may irritate musical purists on the one hand, and liturgical purists on the other. But those who disagree with him will have to work hard to refute him convincingly on either

score within a Christian frame of reference.

*Words, Music, and the Church* should be read, and it should be read slowly and with imagination. Done in this way, it can be instrumental in making worship that drama

whose essence "is not in the entertainment of a passive audience, but in the involvement of a community in a total response to the fundamental data" (p. 177).

LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

## ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHERS

- Abingdon Press, 201 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn. 37203  
 Barnes & Noble, Publishers, 105 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003  
 Basic Books, Inc., 404 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016  
 Columbia University Press, 136 South Broadway, Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10533  
 Darton, Longman, & Todd Ltd., 64 Chiswock High Road, London, W.4  
 Wm. B. Eerdmans, 255 Jefferson Avenue South, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502  
 Fortress Press, 2900 Queen Lane, Philadelphia, Penna. 19129  
 Herder & Herder, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016  
 Jewish Publication Society of America, 222 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Penna. 19102  
 John Knox Press, Box 1176, Richmond, Va. 23209  
 Ktav Publishing House, 120 East Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10002  
 Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016  
 Pilgrim Press, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. 02108  
 Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632  
 Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017  
 Sheed & Ward, Inc., 64 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003  
 S.P.C.K., Marylebone Road, London, N.W. 1  
 Saint Andrew Press, 121 George Street, Edinburgh 2, Scotland

# Bibliography of Faculty Publications, 1968

ARTHUR M. ADAMS

## Article

"Communication and Decision in the United Presbyterian Church," *Monday Morning*, XXXIII, 18, i-xxiv. (Also published as booklet by the Office of General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1968.)

## Reviews

R. E. Moore & D. L. Day, *Urban Church Breakthrough*, *P. S. Bulletin*, LX, 2, 78-79.  
John D. Perry, Jr., *The Coffee House Ministry*, *ibid.*, 79-80.  
Gayle Janowitz, *Helping Hands*, *ibid.*, 80.  
Allen W. Graves, *Using and Maintaining Church Property*, *ibid.*, 80.  
Lyle Schaller, *The Local Church Looks to the Future*, *ibid.*, LXI, 3, 108-109.  
John L. Casteel, ed., *The Creative Role of Interpersonal Groups in the Church Today*, *ibid.*, 109.

JOHN WM. ALDRIDGE

## Article

"Computer: Threat or Promise?," *The Cumberland Presbyterian*, CXXXX, 14, 8-9.

DIOGENES ALLEN

## Book

*The Reasonableness of Faith*, World Publishing Co., Cleveland, pp. xx & 135.

## Chapter in Book

"Motives, Rationales, and Religious Beliefs," in *Religious Language and the Problem of Religious Knowledge*, ed. Ronald E. Santoni, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Ind., pp. 348-361.

## Article

"The New Openness to Faith," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 3, 31-35.

## Reviews

Alvin Plantinga, *God and Other Minds*, in *Theology Today*, XXV, 2, 263-264.  
Peter R. Baelz, *Christian Theology and Meta-*

*physics*, in *Presbyterian Outlook*, CL, 39, 15.

Dallas High, *Language, Persons, and Belief*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 75.

GEORGES A. BARROIS

## Article

"Closed Communion, Open Communion, Intercommunion?" *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, XII, 3-4, 142-156.

## Review

Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, in *Theology Today*, XXIV, 4, 516-518.

W. MALCOLM CLARK

## Article

"The Animal Series in the Primeval History," *Vetus Testamentum*, XVIII, 4, 433-449.

## Reviews

Alger F. Johns, *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVII, 2, 234-235.

Norbert Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid*, *ibid.*, LXXXVII, 4, 474-475.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

## Reviews

Otto Ploeger, *Das Buch Daniel* (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Band 18), in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 24 (1967), 357-358.

Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible. A Historical Geography* (trans. by A. F. Rainey), in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 3, 95-96.

BERTIL E. GÄRTNER

## Chapters in Book

"The Eucharist as Sacrifice in the New Testament," pp. 27-35, and "The Words of Institution," pp. 75-79, in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III* (1968).

## Article

"The Pauline and Johannine Idea of 'To Know God' against the Hellenistic Back-



ground," *New Testament Studies*, XIV, 209-231.

#### Review

G. van Groningen, *First Century Gnosticism: Its Origin and Motifs, in Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXX, 614-615.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

#### Articles

"What the Pennsylvania Dutch Dialect Has Meant in My Life," *Pennsylvania Folklife*, XVII, 4, 8-11 (Summer, 1968).

"Pentecost," *First* (The First Presbyterian Church, Princeton, N.J.), II, 8 (May, 1968).

#### Reviews

Th. C. Vriezen, *The Religion of Ancient Israel*, in *The Pulpit*, XXXIX, 9 (October, 1968), 27.

Joseph Rhymer, *The Beginnings of a People*, *ibid.*

DAVID M. HAY

#### Reviews

Johannes Munck, *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 78.

Johannes Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles* (The Anchor Bible), *ibid.*, 1, 83-84.

SEWARD HILTNER

#### Book

*Preface to Pastoral Theology* (Chinese edition, translated by Isaac Ma). Chinese Christian Literature Council, Hong Kong, 1968.

#### Chapters in Books

"The Bible Speaks to the Health of Man," in *Dialogue in Medicine and Theology*, ed. by Dale White. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1968, pp. 51-79.

Review of Joseph Fletcher's *Situation Ethics*, in *The Situation Ethics Debate*, ed. by Harvey Cox. The Westminster Press, 1968, Philadelphia, pp. 51-54.

"The Role of the Clergy," with L. L. McGee, in *Suicidal Behaviors: Diagnosis and Management*, ed. by H.L.P. Resnik. Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1968, pp. 462-474.

#### Articles

"Gordon W. Allport: In Memoriam," in *Pastoral Psychology*, 19, 181 (February 1968), 65-67.

"On Writing for Ministers," *ibid.*, 19, 180 (January 1968), 3-5.

"Bibliography of Seward Hiltner," *ibid.*, 19, 180 (January 1968), 6-22.

"The Christian Understanding of Sin in the Light of Medicine and Psychiatry," *ibid.*, 19, 187 (October 1968), 45-55. Reprinted from *Medical Arts and Sciences*.

"Faith and Cosmology," *ibid.*, 19, 187 (October 1968), 5-7.

"Samuel H. Miller: In Memoriam," *ibid.*, 19, 184 (May 1968), 4-5.

"Pastoral Psychology—After Paul Tillich," *ibid.*, 19, 181 (February 1968), 5-6.

"Psychology and Passion Plays," *ibid.*, 19, 183 (April 1968), 5-7.

"Thanksgiving and Elections," *ibid.*, 19, 188 (November 1968), 5-7.

Preface to "That Thy Saving Health May Be Known: An Evaluation of the Coonoor Conference on the Healing Ministry of the Church," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, St. Louis, Occasional Papers No. 2 (May 1968), 1-4.

"Is Marriage Always a Risk?" *Presbyterian Life*, 21, 1 (November 1, 1968), 4-5.

"What Can We Learn about Sex from the Bible?" *ibid.*, 21, 13 (July 1, 1968), 6-7.

"The Teaching of Practical Theology in the United States in the Twentieth Century," *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 1 (Autumn 1967), pp. 61-75.

"Salvation's Message about Health," *International Review of Missions*, LVII, 226 (April 1968), 157-174.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

#### Articles

"All Things New," *Pulpit Digest*, XLVIII, 35410-12, 52. Reprinted in *First*, First Presbyterian Church.

"The Church in the World," *Theology Today*, XXV, 1, 88-92; XXV, 2, 236-245; XXV, 4, 462-473.

#### Chapter in Book

"Practical and Pastoral Theology—Survey on Literature" (1960-66), in a *Theological Book List 1968*, The Theological Education Fund, London, 80-86.

## Sermon

"Going Beyond Easter," in *The Pulpit*, XXXIX, 4, 4-6.

## Reviews

Julian N. Hartt, *A Christian Critique of American Culture*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 69-70.

Ralph G. Turnbull, *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*, *ibid.*, 3, 99.

Edward Farley, *Requiem for a Lost Piety*, *ibid.*, 100.

J. Manning Potts, ed., *Listening to the Saints*, *ibid.*, 100-101.

Donald G. Bloesch, *The Crisis of Piety*, *ibid.*, 102.

Charles McKirachan, *Older Than Eden*, *ibid.*, 102-103.

## General

Contributing Editor of *Theology Today*.

NORMAN V. HOPE

## Articles

"How to be Good and Mad," *Christianity Today*, XII, 2 (July 19), 3-5.

"Was Jesus Meek and Mild?," *ibid.*, XIII (November 22), 6-7.

## Reviews

Philip E. Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers*, in *Theology Today*, XXIV, 4, 537-538.

Ruth Rouse & Stephen C. Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948*, *ibid.*, XXV, 1, 139-140.

EDWARD J. JURJI

## Article

"Interfaith and the Intercultural Communication," in *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions*, XV, 2, 81-93.

## Reviews

Mircea Eliade, ed., *From Primitive to Zen; A Thematic Sourcebook of the History of Religions in the Christian Century*, LXXXV, 4, 114-115.

Helmer, Ringgren & Ako V. Strom (ed. J.C.G. Greig, tr. Niels L. Jensen), in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 73-75; *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, V, 2, 414-416.

## General

Member Consultant Staff: The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (Editors, Jesse Stein and Laurence Ur-dang). College Edition, Random House, New York.

Advisory Editor, *The Muslim World*.

Book Review Editor, *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*.

HUGH T. KERR

## Pamphlet

*A Year with the Bible*, Westminster Press, pp. 1-24.

## Articles

"Beyond the Crossroads," in *Theology Today*, XXV, 1, 8-9.

"From People to Persons," *ibid.*, XXV, 2, 145-148.

"The Rhetoric of Theology," *ibid.*, XXV, 3, 291-294.

## General

Editor, *Theology Today*.

S T KIMBROUGH, JR.

## Article

"The Dark Age Grows Light: Studies in the Jewish Intertestamental Literature." (Leader's Resource Articles) *Westminster Adult Leader*, XI, 4, 7-30.

## Review

Robert C. Dentan, *The Knowledge of God in Ancient Israel*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 3, 96-98.

JAMES N. LAPSLEY

## Article

"Personhood in a Technological World," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 36-41.

## Reviews

Susanne K. Langer, *Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling* (Vol. I), in *Theology Today*, XXV, 1, 111.

William B. Oglesby, *Referral in Pastoral Counseling*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, CL, 35, 15.

Paul W. Pruyser, *A Dynamic Psychology of Religion*, in *Christian Advocate*, XII, 20, 17-19.

Edward V. Stein, *Guilt: Theory and Therapy*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 103-104.

JOHN A. MACKAY

#### Articles

"The Ecumenical Movement Whence? and Whither?," *Bulletin* of the Department of Theology of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (Geneva).

*Ecce Homo*, editorial in *Leader*, Lima, Peru (Spanish). Commemoration of the founding of the Colegio Angelo Peruanos in 1917.

*Religion in Latin America*, The Inter-American Defense College (September), Washington, D.C. (Portuguese Edition).

DONALD MACLEOD

#### Chapters in Books

"The Christian and Freedom," in *The Upper Room Disciplines*, pp. 188-194.

"Sermon Outlines," in Doran's *The Ministers Manual*, pp. 87, 154, 189, 205, and 209.

#### Reviews

William R. Seaman, *Daily Prayer for Family and Private Use*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, CL, 18, 15.

Glenn H. Asquith, *Preaching According to Plan*, *ibid.*, 32, 15.

Reuel L. Howe, *Partners in Preaching*, *ibid.*, 33, 15.

John E. Skoglund, *A Manual of Worship*, *ibid.*, 41, 15; and in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 3, 106-107.

James A. Jones, *Prayers for the People*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 78-79.

John Stacey, *About the Ministry*, *ibid.*, 79-80.

David H. C. Read, *Holy Common Sense*, *ibid.*, 80.

John W. Grant, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union*, *ibid.*, 90-91.

James F. White, *The Worldliness of Worship*, *ibid.*, 3, 105-106.

J. Neville Ward, *The Use of Praying*, *ibid.*, 107.

William Barclay, *The Lord's Supper*, *ibid.*, 107-108.

#### General

Editor, *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*.

JACK M. MAXWELL

#### Reviews

Duke Ellington, *A Sacred Concert*, in *Theology Today*, XXV, 1, 120-123.

James F. White, *The Worldliness of Worship*, in *Religion in Life*, XXXVII, 1, 136-137.

Kay Baxter, *And I look for the Resurrection*, *ibid.*, 4, 645.

Carlyle Marney, *The Crucible of Redemption*, *ibid.*

Samuel L. Terrien, *The Power to Bring Forth*, *ibid.*

Julius Melton, *Presbyterian Worship in America: Changing Patterns Since 1787*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 84-86.

JAMES I. MCCORD

#### Articles

"The Lord's Song in a Strange Land," in *The YWCA Magazine*, LXII, 2, 10-11.

"Presentation of COCU," in *The Ecumenist*, VI, 2, 113-118.

#### Reviews

Robert W. Henderson, *The Teaching Office in the Reformed Tradition*, in *Theology Today*, XXIV, 4, 533-534.

BRUCE M. METZGER

#### Books

*Historical and Literary Studies; Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, and Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, pp. x + 170, + 20 plates (= *New Testament Tools and Studies*, vol. VIII).

*The Text of the New Testament, its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (second edition), Oxford University Press, New York, pp. xii + 284, + 16 plates.

*Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek*, trans. into Korean by Theodore Hard, The Korea Society for Reformed Faith and Action [Pusan], pp. 85.

#### Reviews

*The Jerusalem Bible, in Yearbook of American Churches*, 238-239.

- E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*, in *Theology Today*, XXIV, 4 (January), 549-550.
- Geddes MacGregor, *A Literary History of the Bible*, in *Christianity Today*, XI, 19 (June 21), 31-32.
- Manuel de Tuya and José Salguero, *Introducción a la Biblia*, 2 vols., in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVII, 3 (September), 350-351.

DANIEL L. MIGLIORE

#### Articles

- "Theological Table-Talk," in *Theology Today*, XXV, 2, 225-235.
- "The 'Theology of Hope' in Perspective," in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 3, 42-50.

#### Reviews

- Carl E. Braaten, *History and Hermeneutics*, in *Theology Today*, XXIV, 4, 544-547.
- Van A. Harvey, *The Historian and the Believer*, *ibid.*
- Jurgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, *ibid.*, XXV, 3, 387-389.

JAMES HASTINGS NICHOLS

#### Book

- Corporate Worship in the Reformed Tradition*, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Penna., pp. 190.

OTTO A. PIPER

#### Article

- "Resurrection," in *First* (The First Presbyterian Church, Princeton, N.J.), II, 4 (April 1968).

#### Review

- Hans Werner, *Allegorie und Erlebnis bei Luther*, in *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte*, LVIII, 7, 258-259.

DONALD B. ROGERS

#### Articles

- "Analogy and Religious Education: A Continuing Discussion" in *Religious Education*, LXIII (March-April 1968), 2, 137.

#### Reviews

- Pierre Babin, *Methods, Approaches for the Catechesis of Adolescents*, in *Religious Education*, LXIII (May-June 1968), 3, 228-229.
- C. Ellis Nelson, *Where Faith Begins* in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 87-89.

RICHARD SHAULL

#### Chapters in Books

- "Toward a Reformulation of Objectives," in *Protestant Crosscurrents in Mission*, ed. by Norman Horner, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 81-107.
- "The Rehabilitation of Ideology," in *Religion and International Affairs*, ed. by Jeffrey Rose & Michael Ignatieff, House of Anansi, Toronto, pp. 99-111.
- "Human Rights and Economic Development," in *Human Rights in World Perspective*, ed. by Blaise Levai, Saint Paul School of Theology Methodist, Kansas City, Missouri, pp. 48-56.
- "Für eine neue theologische Perspektive," in *Theologie im Umbruch*, Chr. Kaiser Verlag München, pp. 211-221.
- "A Crise nas Igrejas Nacionais," in *Protestantismo e Imperialismo na America Latina*, Vozes, Petropolis, pp. 37-55.

#### Articles

- "Christian Realism: A Symposium," in *Christianity and Crisis*, XXVIII, 14, 175-190.
- "Failure of a Mission," in *Tempo*, I, 5, 12.
- "Crisis in the Churches," in *World Encounter*, VI, 1, 9-11.
- "He Who Lives, Can Die," in *Presbyterian Survey*, LVIII, 11, 15-17.
- "The New Latin Revolutionaries and the U.S.," in *Christian Century*, LXXXV, 3, 69-70.
- "The Political Significance of Parabolic Action," in *Motive*, XXVIII, 7, 27-29.
- "A Theological Perspective on Human Liberation," in *New Blackfriars*, XL, 578, 509-517.
- "Theology and the Transformation of Society," in *Theology Today*, XXV, 1, 21-25.
- "University Education for World Responsibility," in *Federation News*, 1968, 1, 21-25.
- "La foi chretienne, scandale dans une civilisation technocratique," in *Bulletin du Centre Protestant d'Etudes*, Geneve, XX, 3,



17-27. Also in *Consumers or Revolutionaries*, Foyer John Knox, Geneva.

"Nationale Ontwikkeling en Sociale Revolutie," in *Wending*, September, 1968.

## LAURENCE HULL STOOKEY

### Article

"Put God Back in Infant Baptism," in *Christian Advocate*, XII, 25, 13-14.

### Reviews

Trevor Dearing, *Wesleyan and Tractarian Worship—An Ecumenical Study*, in *P. S. Bulletin*, LXI, 2, 86-87.

Robert C. Monk, *John Wesley—His Puritan Heritage*, *ibid.*

## CHARLES C. WEST

### Chapters in Books

"Varieties of Unbelief," in *Lambeth Conference 1968, Preparatory Essays*, S.P.C.K., London, England, pp. 43-78.

"Oikoumene in Missionary Perspective," in *The Word in the Third World*, ed. James P. Cotter, Corpus Books, Washington, D.C., pp. 44-111.

"Technologues et révolutionnaires" in *Une*

*Théologie de la révolution?*, éditions Labor et Fides, Genève, Switzerland, pp. 76-118.

### Articles

"The Problem of Ethics Today," in *Theology Today*, XXV, 3, 341-365.

"Josef Hromadka, or Faith Fallen Among Communism," in *Dialogue* (Vienna, Austria), I, 1, 80-86.

"Czechoslovakia," in *Engage* (September 15, 1968), 7, 16.

"Christian-Marxist Dialogue: A Bibliography," in *Social Action*, XXXV, 3, 40-48.

## D. CAMPBELL WYCKOFF

### Article

"The Import of the 'Bloom Taxonomies' for Religious Education," *Religious Education*, LXIII, 6, 478-484.

### Book Reviews

Joseph P. Donnelly, S. J. (ed.), *Wilderness Kingdom, Indian Life in the Rocky Mountains, 1840-47, The Journals and Paintings of Father Nicholas Point*, in *Theology Today*, XXV, 2, 274-277.

Barry McLaughlin, S. J., *Nature, Grace, and Religious Development*, in *Approach*, II, 10, 2.





